THE FOURTH EVANGELIST

The Fourth Evangelist
Dramatist or Historian?

By R. H. STRACHAN, M.A., D.D.
Author of *The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment; The Soul of Modern Poetry.*

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
LIBRARY OF
BS
2615.2
.S719
1925
38.414

NEW YORK:
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

First Printed, 1925

Printed in Great Britain by C. Tinling & Co., Ltd.,
Liverpool, London and Prescot.

TO THE MEMORY
OF MY LIFE-LONG FRIEND,
JAMES DAVID SYMON
POET, CRITIC, AND NOVELIST.

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
FEB 21 1957

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgments are due to Messrs. T. & T. Clark and to the Editor for permission to make extensive use of a series of Articles published some years ago in *The Expository Times*, entitled, *Is the Fourth Gospel a Literary Unity?*; also to the Student Christian Movement for permission to reprint the analysis of the Gospel published in my book, *The Fourth Gospel: its Significance and Environment*, and to quote from the book elsewhere. I am also indebted, far more deeply than one or two footnotes indicate, to Professor E. F. Scott's, *The Fourth Gospel: its Purpose and Theology*.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	DRAMATIST OR HISTORIAN? . .	11
II.	THE HISTORIAN—	
	1. THE GOSPEL OF EXPERIENCE .	41
	2. THE BELOVED DISCIPLE . .	45
	3. DEAD FACT AND LIVING TRUTH .	59
	4. DOES THE EVANGELIST INTEND TO SUPPLEMENT THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS?	63
	5. ANALOGY WITH THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS	67
	6. "HISTORICAL SERMONS" AND "ALIEN FRAGMENTS" . .	70
III.	IS THE GOSPEL A LITERARY UNITY?	
	1. THE IDEAL PLAN . . .	84
	2. THE CHRONOLOGICAL PLAN .	101
	APPENDIX TO CHAPTER III . .	113

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. THE WORLD-CRISIS IN THE EVANGELIST'S DAY—

INTRODUCTORY 116

1. THE WANDERING PREACHERS . 131

2. RELIGIOUS MAGIC . . 133

3. THE MYSTERY-RELIGIONS . 141

V. MIRACLES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL . 152

VI. THE DISCOURSES 174

VII. THE POLEMICAL AIMS IN THE GOSPEL . 192

1. ANTI-JEWISH . . . 193

2. ANTI-STOIC 200

3. ANTI-SACRAMENTALIST . . 204

VIII. LAZARUS 225

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VIII . 239

IX. THE DEATH OF JESUS . . . 241

X. THE STORY OF THE RESURRECTION . 280

CHAPTER I

DRAMATIST OR HISTORIAN?

THE Fourth Gospel was written in an atmosphere of Christian thought which was largely created by the missionary activity of Paul, both in Europe and in Asia Minor. Of Paul's utterances about Jesus in the Epistle to the Colossians [1] Denney says: "These "are overwhelming ideas when we think of Jesus of "Nazareth, a Galilean carpenter, who had not "where to lay His head, and reflect that they "have to be associated with Him. The intellectual "daring of them is almost inconceivable; "imagination fails to realise the pressure under "which his mind must have been working when "it rose to the height of these assertions." [2]

The source, however, of this intellectual daring is not uncovered when we are pointed either to the Philonic philosophy or even to the Hebrew personification of Wisdom. When Paul set Christ in the supreme place in the universe, he was applying to the universe—that vast, terrible, and bewildering environment in which humanity is set—the certainty of his own experience that he had come face to face with the presence of God in Christ; he was, again

1. i, 15–20.
2. *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 35.

to quote Denney's words, " not deifying Christ, but Christianising the universe." It does not matter what forms of current philosophical or religious thought he employs in order to give expression to a conception of Christ, which, as he says himself, dawned on his own dark and chaotic soul, as the Light shined straight into the heart of the primæval chaotic darkness,—" God, who commanded the light to shine, hath shined in my heart." Paul is too great a personality to be regarded as merely played upon by his spiritual and intellectual environment in his utterances about Jesus Christ. He became what he was as a Christian by passing through the agony of a tremendous crisis, to describe which he searches almost in vain the resources of language. He was delivered " out of the power of darkness, and translated into the Kingdom of the Son of his love."

Paul's conception of Nature is a tragic one. Both external Nature and the nature of man are in the grasp and under the power of evil demonic forces. " It groaneth and travaileth together in pain." I sometimes think that Thomas Hardy's outlook on Nature is what Paul's would have become, could you have stripped him of all his Christian faith in the redemption of a whole creation by a cosmic Christ. In Paul's writings you find no sense of natural beauty at all. It is rather the terror of Nature that absorbs his attention. There is not a blade of green grass in all his writing. His pre-Christian view is the view of a deeply religious man, who

never doubted the justice of the Divine government of the world, but was gravely conscious of the hostile urge in human nature, the evil passions that lurked "in the flesh," and resisted the law of God, that "other law in his members." He was also deeply aware of the action and interaction of the demonic powers, both good and evil, which, under God, controlled the movement of the Universe. Where we would speak of natural law, Paul would speak of "principalities," "powers," "the rulers of the darkness of this present world," "the spiritual forces of evil in the air around us"[1]. On the whole for Paul, the movement of Nature, human or external, is hostile and threatening, and is under the dominion of the Prince of the power of the air.

These natural forces, personified as Sin, Pain and Death, are regarded as having been met and vanquished by the historical events of the Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. In these he beholds Jesus as engaged in a kind of Homeric contest with the unseen powers of evil. Jesus, by His Passion and Resurrection has become "Lord of heaven and earth," and has gained the victory over the demonic powers. The crucifixion itself he conceives as the work, through human instruments, of these demonic powers. They did not recognise Him; "else they would not have crucified the

1. Eph. vi, 12. "In the air around us" is an attempt to translate Paul's *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*. cf. R. H. Strachan, *Individuality of St. Paul*, pp. 60 ff, pp. 106 ff; *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 40 ff.

Lord of glory." On the Cross, Jesus won a decisive victory over them. "Having despoiled of their dominion the principalities and powers, He exposed them to all the world for what they are, and triumphed over them in the Cross."[1]

The Fourth Gospel is the crown and completion of the missionary and theological activity of Paul. The intellectual background of Paul's preaching was this presentation of the Risen Jesus, whose life on earth and death on the Cross were represented as an awe-inspiring and also love-compelling spiritual drama enacted in the universe. Paul's "good news" was that men, who were in such bondage of fear, might now walk with a new spirit of hope, confidence, and moral victory. Their guilty hearts were eternally at rest, for they could say "Abba, Father." The lover's sweet dynamic of carelessness and freedom and cleansing was in their hearts—"The Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me"—, and the crowning wonder was that in that vast, terrifying universe God had taken the first step. Moreover, Paul had taught that Jesus who is Lord of the Universe, would speedily return, to realise and consummate His spiritual victory on earth.

The Pauline doctrine was deeply rooted in the religious experience and outlook of the Churches in Asia Minor. It is intelligible that it should, after his death, and with the passing of those who had

1. Col. ii, 15.

been "eye-witnesses and servants of the word," tend to be sublimated into a philosophy, which had lost touch with any historic reality. If we call the Fourth Gospel a drama rather than a history of Jesus' life on earth, it has to be remembered that Paul himself is responsible for the conception; but the Fourth Evangelist in the interests of historical reality has transferred this great spiritual drama from heaven to earth.

There are rivers whose source may be traced to a small mountain-spring, whose increasing volume is due to the multitude of their tributaries. There are others like the Nile, which takes its rise in a huge inland lake fed by inexhaustible springs beneath its surface. Christianity is like the second type. Tributaries have made their contribution to it in new forms of thought as the centuries advanced, but its real source is the Person of Jesus Christ. The source is a greater wonder than the river. As we read the Gospel of Mark, which describes "the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ," we receive the impression of the poverty and frailty of the human hearts and memories to whom Jesus entrusted His message and, above all, Himself. The Fourth Evangelist enables us to see the magnificence, the glory of the Personality from whom the stream of Christian faith flows. Jesus remains a greater wonder than His Church.

The Fourth Gospel, in contrast with the Synoptics, represents the figure of Jesus, stripped of most of

those human characteristics that belong to the Jesus of history. There is, undoubtedly, a strong insistence on the true humanity of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, but it is as we shall see, a conscious and deliberate insistence, as contrasted with those spontaneous manifestations of humanity—compassion, joy, perplexity, sorrow, humour, irony, anger, —that meet us everywhere in the earlier gospels. The Fourth Evangelist is occupied in insisting that the cosmic Christ truly identified Himself, as the Word made flesh, with human nature as itself a part of the cosmos, and that in the human existence of Jesus of Nazareth, there shone that "glory," in which the Church's faith now beheld Him. The "world," represented as hostile to Christ, is that portion of the human "cosmos" which rejected Him through unbelief. The contrast with the miracles and words of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels is startling, and will be more fully dealt with in another chapter.

The Gospel is conceived in dramatic form. The ominous note of tragedy is struck in the Prologue (i, 1–18) itself,—"He came unto his own, and his own received him not"; not only the note of tragedy but we have also sharply contrasted modes of thought, Light and Darkness, Life and Death, Faith and Unbelief. These contrasts indicate that a clear line of division has been introduced into the world by the coming of Jesus Christ. We perceive at once that the writer's mind is dwelling upon the

thought of Genesis I, where the first step in creation is to divide light from darkness. The narrative on which he is about to enter is conceived as a story of creation, the drama of the new moral and spiritual creation inaugurated by Jesus, the Word of God. As the darkness fled before the creative word, "Let there be light," so the moral darkness of the world could not arrest the Divine Light that came into the world in the person of Jesus Christ. A new race is brought to birth, "the children of God," born not of the flesh, but of the will of God,—they "that believe on his name." The Prologue is the prelude to a drama in which the protagonists are—Jesus the Word of God, and the evil powers of Darkness and Unbelief. The Gospel ends, as it began, with an act of creation, in which our Lord breathes into His disciples Life, the Holy Spirit. The Evangelist sets out to tell the story of Jesus' life on earth from this point of view.

If we examine the incidents, and the discourses that follow them, we shall find that in them also these contrasts reappear. The scheme of the work appears as a series of movements or cycles. All of them illustrate this conflict of Light with Darkness, Life with Death, Faith with Unbelief. The climax is reached in Chapters xiii–xx, which tell the story of the final conflict between the Lord of Light and the Prince of Darkness; the Lord of Life and the lords of Death. Therein is seen the final triumph of Faith and the defeat of Unbelief.

These chapters contain the drama of the victorious struggle of the Saviour of the world with the Prince of this world. In Chapters i–xii, both the narrative and the teaching alike are but drapery, clothing the solemn and majestic central Figure, who moves in unbroken communion with the Father, doing the will of God ; now resisted by, now subduing human wills and purposes to the over-mastering Divine purpose of realising a Kingdom, a Sovereignty which is not of this world.

That the Evangelist intends the Passion Story to represent the dramatic climax of his work is clearly seen by the use he makes of the conception of the " hour." The divinely appointed " hour " dominates the whole from the very beginning, and until that hour has struck, no pressure of human affection or of human hatred can anticipate the crowning manifestation of Love and Power on the Cross.[1] The Cross itself, in Pauline fashion, is represented as a combat with " the Prince of this world," in which the Prince of this world is cast out,[2] and Jesus exalted. He is " lifted up," and becomes the world's Saviour. Dramatic irony is particularly apparent in the account of the behaviour of the various characters involved in the closing events of Christ's life. Peter says, " I will lay down my life for thy sake," a promise that, as

1. See more fully, pp. 250 ff.
2. SS. reads " cast down."

tradition asserts, proved true in the end. After Peter's denial, "immediately the cock crew," a symbol of the dawn of a new day in his life: but Judas goes out into Stygian darkness;—"Judas went out and it was night." The attitude of Caiaphas is depicted with powerful, dramatic irony. The Evangelist himself calls attention to the irony of the words, "It is expedient that one man should die for the people." "This he spake not of him-"self and prophesied that Jesus should die for the "nation, and not for the nation only, but that the "children of God scattered abroad might be "gathered into one." Caiaphas' words are all prophecies. "The Romans will come and take "away our place and our nation"—and they did! There is biting irony in this picture of Caiaphas as a Sadducee turned prophet.

The Pharisees are made to say, "Behold the whole world is gone after him," wherein they unconsciously corroborate the title given to Jesus in this Gospel, and illustrated in every chapter—"The Saviour of the World." The title on the Cross, "King of the Jews," is said to have been written in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, the languages of the three great nations of the world. It is a foreshadowing of the lofty imperial title of the world's Saviour, ironically proclaimed by the contemptuous decree of a Roman viceroy. The multitude exclaim, "Will he go unto the dispersed among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?"; and

when certain Greeks desire to see Jesus, He is deeply moved. The spiritual goal is already in sight, and the pagan world begins to lay its tribute at His feet—" Now is the Son of Man glorified." The ironical reference in xviii, 28, to the fear of ceremonial defilement on the part of Jesus' captors, and their consequent refusal to enter the Praetorium, is obvious. It is equally ironical that Pilate, representing the highest imperial authority, should be compelled to yield to their scruples.

The whole account of the dialogue with Pilate is permeated through and through with dramatic irony. Pilate makes much of his imperial " authority." " Knowest thou not that I have authority to " crucify thee, and have authority to release thee ? " Our Lord replies that whatever authority Pilate is clothed with, is given him of God : the rest of the narrative shows him a mere slave to superstitious fears, to his own past, and to the malignant clamour of the populace. The cry " Thou art not Cæsar's friend " is followed by the significant, " When Pilate *therefore* heard that saying, he brought Jesus forth " and with a pitiful appeal to the popular sense of humour, caused Jesus to sit, arrayed as He was, on the imperial tribunal ;—" Behold your King ! " He implies that their patriotic argument was futile ; for there could surely be small danger to the Roman imperial power from such a quarter ! " We have no king but Cæsar," shouts back the hypocritical patriotism of the crowd. As he records

that cry, the Evangelist knows that his readers will also remember that " Cæsar " sacked Jerusalem. Pilate is rudely reminded of the imperial will of which he is the slave, against his own better instincts. The Evangelist also suggests that Jewish hatred actually controlled the imperial government, and that the ultimate determining factor in the crucifixion of Jesus was not the Roman power but the Jewish nation ;—" He that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." The final tragedy was brought about in response to a heartless demand by Christ's own people ; " He came unto his own, and his own received him not." It is indeed true to say that the dramatic power of this Evangelist rises to its greatest height in the story of the closing days.

This dramatic interpretation of the life of Jesus inevitably raises the question of its fidelity to actual historical fact.

In what sense can the Fourth Gospel be said to be historical, inasmuch as, not only in matters of historical detail but in its whole conception of the life of Christ, it differs so fundamentally from the Synoptic Gospels ? No harmony of the Gospels for example, except it be carried through by a forcible means, can possibly include the story of the raising of Lazarus as it stands in the Fourth Gospel. Even after we have removed those editorial elements in the story,[1] which have given it its present place in

1. See pp. 228 ff.

the Gospel as the event which precipitated the final crisis, it is still impossible to give it a place in any historical scheme of the life of Christ. No scientific harmony of the Gospel story can include a Christ who speaks as He does in the Sermon on the Mount, and the Christ who speaks in the discourses of the Fourth Evangelist.[1] In what sense, then, does the Fourth Gospel differ from the other three in historical value?

Browning's words from "A Death in the Desert" are often quoted in this connexion :—

> Since much that at the first, in deed and word,
> Lay simply and sufficiently exposed,
> Had grown (or else my soul had grown to match,
> Fed through such years, familiar with such light,
> Guarded and guided still to see and speak)
> Of new significance and fresh result
> What first were guessed as points, I now knew stars,
> And named them in the Gospel I have writ.

It is indeed the Gospel in which Christian experience has taken up the pen to write. Facts —both words and deeds of Christ—are interpreted, expanded, and added to. We must, however, avoid the serious mistake of contrasting the Fourth Gospel with the other three, so as to call the latter history, and the former alone the transcript of Christian reflection and experience, applied to the historical facts. The writers of the Synoptic Gospels were worshippers of Christ before they became His biographers. Even in the Synoptic Gospels, the actual historical facts are, as in religion

1. This statement does not exclude the historical element in the Johannine Discourses. See pp. 178 ff.

they must ever be, spiritually appropriated. All the Gospels are clearly written ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν. [1] The Christian devotional attitude towards Jesus Christ colours the representation of facts even in the Synoptics, and the place accorded to Jesus in the Gospel of Mark as Lord of the demon world and as Son of God is, religiously, as absolute and as lofty as the representation in the Fourth Gospel. The Fourth Gospel voices no more imperious and daring claim than is implied in Mt. xi, 27—"All things have been delivered unto me of my Father;" "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden." Reflective and hortatory elements are present in all the Gospels, and even Mark is acknowledged to be derived from reminiscences of Peter's preaching. [2]

Wherein, then, consists the distinguishing element in the composition of the Fourth Gospel, as compared with the other three? In this,—that the reflective element is less unconsciously and more creatively and artistically present. This conclusion does not exceed the bounds of what is an essentially Christian method of representing Christ; for He wrote nothing, and was content to entrust Himself, His message, and the growth and government of His Church, to men who believed in Him, and were

1. cf. J. Moffatt, *Introduction to Literature of the New Testament*, pp. 216 f.

2. The cosmic Christ of Paul is also a conception that does not fall short of the conception in the Prologue. (cf. W. R. Inge, *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, xiii, 136a).

enabled to do and to interpret the Will of God and the mind of Jesus as His Spirit guided them. The Fourth Evangelist not only interprets the mind of Christ, but quite clearly points us to the divine source of his interpretations in the Spirit of Christ. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but "ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, "the Spirit of Truth is come, he shall guide you "into all the truth . . . He shall glorify me: for "he shall take of mine and shall declare it unto "you."[1]

It is easy both to underrate and to overrate the significance of historical fact for the Christian faith. Criticism has, however, been far too much occupied in seeking to uncover, in this particular Gospel, a substratum of bare historical fact which may be assigned to an eye-witness, and may therefore be assumed to give greater religious value and authority to the more theological structure that has been built upon it.[2] Such a procedure is calculated both to minimise the historical value of this particular Gospel by contracting the area within which historical fact may be looked for, and to obscure the writer's purpose and method. The Evangelist must, indeed, have had access to fragments of a genuine apostolic tradition; not only the Synoptics, but to some peculiar tradition which may be denoted as Johannine. On several

1. John xvi, 12–14.
2. The most recent attempt is made by Dr. A. E. Garvie in *The Beloved Disciple*.

occasions this Gospel provides material for supplementing and correcting the Synoptists. There is, for example, the account in the opening chapter of Jesus' meeting with several of His disciples in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem during the Baptist revival, before the decisive summons to follow Him in Galilee, related in the Synoptics; the appearance before Annas; the date of the Last Supper, held on the day before the Passover; the story of more than one visit to Jerusalem; the Lazarus story. There are also various geographical and topical details peculiar to this Evangelist—Cana, Sychar, Bethany, Bethsaida, Siloam, the Porch of Solomon, Gabbatha. To this Evangelist also we owe the story of the grave in the garden. New characters are introduced, Nicodemus, The Grecian Jews, Nathanael, Thomas, the Woman of Samaria, Lazarus. He is also acquainted with the Synoptic traditions as is shown by his use of various incidents, which they record. At the same time it is true to say that this Evangelist "writes, not with the "written document in front of him, but from the "vivid reconstruction of the scene as, at the moment "of writing, it stood out before his own mind's ,' eye."[1] This writer does not strike one as making the same careful use of written sources, such as can be disentangled from the Synoptic gospels. That is not his type of mind. The historical interest of this Evangelist does not lie in the direction of

1. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 384.

detail and incident, but in another of much more value to the Church of his day, and of our own ;—namely, the position insisted upon in the great creeds of the Church, and especially the Apostles', that the Christian faith has its origin and basis in an historical personality.

I. Both in the First Epistle and in the Gospel there is an insistence—in the latter often tacit and implied—upon the position that the great Christian truths of the Incarnation and Redemption by the Death of Jesus are founded in actual historical fact. These doctrines, according to the Evangelist, are begotten not of abstract theological reasoning, but are displayed in the actual human life of the "Word" which became flesh. The position is quite clearly and definitely stated in the First Epistle—"Hereby "know we what love is, because he laid down his "life for us ; so ought we to lay down our lives for "the brethren . . . Thus was the love of God made "manifest among us, that God sent his only son "into the world, that by him we might live."[1] The assertion that the "word became flesh," and was therefore a truly human personality, is the keynote of the whole book.[2] From this point of view, the

1. 1 Ep. iii, 16 ; iv, 9.

2. Dr. A. E. Garvie (*The Beloved Disciple* ; *passim*) seems to think that the tendency of my book, *The Fourth Gospel*: *its Significance and Environment*, is to minimise the historical value of the Fourth Gospel. The answer depends on whether historicity depends ultimately on historical details and "marks of an eye-witness," or upon the assurance brought by the Fourth Evangelist's work that the Christ of Paul and of the Christian Faith is congruous with belief in an historic personality.

Evangelist is more deeply interested in the fact than in the idea. He is completely aware that neither the love of God, nor the human obligation of love to our fellows, can persist as real moral and spiritual dynamics in human life, unless they are much more than even divinely inspired intuitions. Christian principles cannot continue to operate in the world with that unwearied insight and sympathy which ought to direct them; men will not have that permanent and personal assurance that God is Father, especially in moments of moral weariness and spiritual perplexity,—unless they can obtain an inexhaustible driving power in the historical fact, that the love of God to man and God's valuation of the meanest human personality was for all time displayed in the human life and character of Jesus Christ. To depreciate the historical revelation of God in His relation to human life, is to lose sight of the ends God has in view; on these conditions, love, both human and divine, becomes a "cut flower, not a living plant."[1]

The Evangelist's historical interest is, in the first place not for the purpose of establishing the truth of

1. "The historical element is a note of all the higher faiths, "and wherever, as in the case of Hinduism, the sense of history "is weak, there is a danger of human personality becoming "vague." J. Moffatt, *The Approach to the New Testament*, p. 148. One characteristic of contemporary religious ethnic thought was the pathetic desire to identify and to realise the ideal of the "perfect man" in historical figures. Their φιλανθρωπία was more "tangible" than that of mythical personages. cf. 1 Jn. 1^1; Titus, 3^4. Wendland, *Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur* ($3^{d.}$ Ed.) pp. 48 f.; S. Angus, *The Mystery-Religions*, p. 183.

certain details in the life of Jesus, but of shewing that the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith are not mere rhapsodies of speculative thought, but rooted in historic reality; that if these are to preserve their vitality, they must be closely linked up with the actual appearing of the Word of God in human flesh. The key to this historical interest is to be found in the intellectual atmosphere of the day, where doubt was actually being cast by heretical systems of thought upon the reality of the human birth, the human personality, and, above all, the human suffering of Jesus. In the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, Jesus is said to suffer "as one who feels no pain." This tendency is known as Docetism, the teaching that Christ was not really human, but only *appeared* to be a man. The tendency was inevitable in the first and second centuries, but is one that is continually at work in Christian thinking. In general its origin may be traced to reverence for the person of Jesus, the God-man, and it is already at work in the later Synoptics, where the human traits (compassion, astonishment, etc.), of Jesus are nowhere so dwelt upon as in the earliest Gospel, the Gospel of Mark. In Matthew and in Luke these are often deliberately omitted in passages otherwise founded on Mark. The conception that lay behind this reverential feeling arose, on the one hand, from the impact on the Church's thought of Greek notions as to what constituted a divine being; and on the other

hand, to a widespread conviction that matter was inherently evil, and therefore it was impossible that Deity could have assumed an actual body of flesh and blood. In the Apocryphal Acts of John, the Divine Christ returns to heaven, and leaves the human Jesus to be crucified. It was thought that a divine being could not actually feel pain, or be subject to suffering (παθητός), or death. The Evangelist's main concern is, therefore, to persuade his readers that history justifies the faith that a Divine Being actually did become truly man, and shared all the experiences of human life to the full, without losing any of His divine significance as the Son of God.

It is not, therefore, surprising that in this Gospel there is not the same range of interest in historical detail as in the others, and it is all the more easy to understand why the portrait of Jesus is less vivid than that contained in the Synoptic Gospels. The Evangelist selects those aspects of Jesus' life on earth which most clearly display the doctrine, that He is indeed the Word of God incarnate in humanity, as founded in historic fact. The selection may in some cases be deliberate, but as happens always when the creative personality of a writer is at work, the selection may also be instinctive; certain details of interest only to a biographer drop away, and those that remain have both passed through the crucible of the writer's personal experience, and been subjected to the pressure of the main

idea which governs the whole writing. The writer's governing conception is that He by whom the worlds were made, has uttered His whole creative personality in Jesus Christ, His only-begotten Son, a Being of flesh and blood. As, in Philo's thought, Creation—or as we would say, "Nature" —has the "seal" of God impressed upon it which is the "Logos," so in the Christ of this Gospel, God has impressed His seal on humanity. "Him hath God the Father sealed." The believer in Christ, on the other hand, who has accepted the new relationship as a child of the Father, has "set his seal that God is true." The world of reality for this Evangelist is not made visible to the senses of sight and touch, but is seen in the vision of God the Father, given in Jesus Christ, controlling the world of external concrete fact. The seal of God has been set, not merely on external nature, but on a new creation—a humanity which controls Nature, and is no longer its plaything or its slave. "We beheld "his glory, the glory as of an only-begotten of the "Father, full of grace and reality."

It is because vast issues are involved for humanity that the Evangelist lays such emphasis on the Incarnation as an actual historical fact. That God should have found it impossible fully to identify Himself with human life in its subjection to sin, pain, and mortality, lest He lose or tarnish His Divine nature, would have been a disaster of infinite magnitude. The earthly life of Jesus in

this Gospel appears as a dramatic interlude in the life of the Eternal Logos. In modern terms, it may be described as a moment in the immanence of God in His creation,—" He tabernacled among us, and we beheld His glory"; "He came from God, and went to God." Yet that interlude of the earthly life in the midst of the eternal existence of the Logos was the divine answer flashed on the lives of men who were saddened by such a thought of human life as we find in Marcus Aurelius—" yesterday a little mucus, to-morrow a mummy or burnt ash."[1] The fact of the Incarnation, therefore, was too intimately bound up in the mind of the Evangelist with the Christian conception of humanity and its eternal possibilities, to allow any tampering, in the interests of preconceived theories of deity, with the faith that Jesus Christ was truly man; for the Incarnation and the Cross of Christ are the guarantee of the eternal significance of human life, and its redemption from the power of evil. The Fourth Evangelist has the same practical interest in the historical reality of the Incarnation as a moral and spiritual dynamic as Ignatius when he says:— " Jesus Christ was truly born and ate and drank, " was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was " truly crucified and died in the sight of those in " heaven and those on earth and those under the " earth; who, moreover, was truly raised from " the dead . . . , His Father having raised Him."

1. *Confessions*, IV, 48.

"If it were . . . that He suffered only in "semblance . . . why am I in bonds? Why also "do I desire to fight with wild beasts? So I die "in vain."[1] Human sorrow and human suffering, and the struggle with evil, become radiant with light in the experience of men, who believe that in the historical person of Jesus, in His life, death and resurrection, God Himself was manifest, sharing and ennobling all those experiences of our mortal life, and guaranteeing victory. Men needed to be assured of the factual nature of the Christian faith, and therein lies the historical interest of the Fourth Evangelist. In other words, the Fourth Gospel is the first great attempt of a Christian thinker to justify before a world of alien thought that act of intellectual daring which enabled Christian faith in the first century to worship Jesus as God; for there must have been many in the first century as there are in our own, who find it difficult to identify the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels with the Christ of Paul. There were no doubt many in these early days, as there are to-day, who failed to understand that the Pauline theology was no mere flight of lyric emotion, but the inevitable inference from the life and death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, as interpreted by Christian experience.

II. This tendency to deny the material existence of Jesus as the Incarnate Son of God probably existed

1. *Ad Trallianos* (*Trans.* Lightfoot) iv; x.

alongside another, equally dangerous to the Christian faith. This second tendency was the product of legalistic and conservative minds which laid great stress on the tradition of fact and word.[1] The reminiscences of the earlier eye-witnesses and servants of the word began to suffer the fate of all reminiscences when their authors are dead—they tended to become fresh "traditions of the elders."

There is an indication in this Gospel that its author is, once at least, openly antagonising a legalistic interpretation both of doctrine and of conduct. The passage v, 37–41 is significant in this connexion. "Ye search the scriptures because ye think that in "their pages ye possess eternal life. They actually "bear witness to me, but ye refuse to come to me "for life. Glory I receive not from men."[2] The indictment is that the Old Testament Scriptures given by God through human experience and interpreted by men, have taken the place of God Himself in the Jewish faith. "The Father who sent me has "himself borne testimony to me. His voice ye have "never heard, his form ye have never seen, his word "ye have not abiding in you, because him whom he "sent, ye do not believe." Words like these can only have a reference to a wrong use of the written word generally, and be intended to antagonise those Jewish notions of what an inspired word must be,

1. cf. E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p 8.
2. cf. xvii, 24.

which, carried over into the Christian Church, have done such infinite harm.

The Evangelist seeks to preserve the world from the spectacle of Christianity—too often since presented—struggling as Judaism had already begun to do, for the authenticity of its traditional theories of scripture as though thereby it were fighting for its life. Waterless Jerusalem was continually engaged, in the course of her chequered history of assaults and sieges, in a struggle to preserve such pools and springs as nature had given her—" to keep the waters in," as Sir G. Adam Smith puts it. Christianity, too, as though in a state of siege, has been often engaged in jealously guarding her supplies of living water which she regarded as stored in the words and history of past generations. The whole passage just quoted, while it illuminates our Lord's own attitude to Scripture, also enables us to see into the mind of the Evangelist himself, and to understand his attitude even to such records of the ministry and teaching of Jesus as were current in the contemporary Church. He is alive to the danger of " associating too closely the acts and " doctrines of the Christian community with " particular events in the career of Jesus on earth ";[1] he saw clearly that to foster the habit of tethering Christian doctrine to particular occasions in the past, was not only to fetter its development, but might lead to the view that it was only of local

1. Burkitt, *Gospel History*, p. 245.

origin and incapable of universal application. We may assume that even in his own day the priceless "reminiscences" contained in the Synoptic Gospels and in oral tradition had acquired in many minds a merely legal force,—as the example of the *Didache* itself shows. They tended to become, in Plato's phrase, "like books, unable to ask or to answer questions."[1] That Hellenic spirit of free enquiry, and of distaste for the written—as against the spoken—word as the norm of human conduct, appears in the Fourth Gospel. The Fourth Evangelist may be said to register practically the same protest as Plato. Speaking of the traditionalists of his day, whose aim seemed to be to save people the trouble of thinking and to administer an opiate to the reason, he likens them to a vessel of brass, which when struck, "rings loud, and continues to ring, unless you stop it by laying on your finger."[2] A vital religion can never be secure on the basis of mere historical credentials; otherwise it becomes a branch of antiquarian research; we must "hold "our trust in God by the same tenure as our trust "in man, that of living and growing *personal* "impression; beginning, it may be, in outward "historical evidence, but quite unable to hold and "extend its influence on that evidence alone."[3]

1. *Protagoras*, 329. cf. Butcher, *Aspects of Greek Genius*, p. 197.
2. Compare Butcher, *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius*, pp. 177 ff. To this chapter of his book I owe a great debt.
3. R. H. Hutton, *Theological Essays*, p. 167.

III. This Evangelist, by his attitude towards historical fact, has also made an invaluable contribution to Christian Ethics. In his insistence on Jesus as a historical Person, he shows himself deeply aware that Christian conduct must always have both the sanction and the determining influence of an historical example. Throughout the whole New Testament not alone the actions and words of Jesus of Nazareth are our norm for conduct, but also the dynamic fact of the Incarnation. This is quite simply and definitely stated, as we have seen, in the first Epistle of John. "We know what love is by this, "that he laid down his life for us . . . This is how "the love of God has appeared for us, by God "sending his only Son into the world, that by him "we might live."[1] Paul, also, when he would seek the supreme ethical example and motive, finds it in the Incarnation; in the example of Him "who, being rich, for our sake became poor"; and the moving theological description of the Incarnation in Philipp. ii, 1–11, is introduced by the words, "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." The Evangelist, in his emphasis on the historical reality of Jesus is only enriching the powerful and unique Jewish contribution to the spiritual life of the world, as it is enlarged and deepened in the Christian Faith—the conviction that religion and morality are one.

The tendency towards a legalistic interpretation

1. 1 Ep. iii, 16; iv, 9. (Moffatt's Translation.)

of Jesus' teaching is represented very early in Christian literature. In the *Didache*, a Christian writing of a date contemporary with the Gospel, Christian conduct consists in doing what Christ commanded. "Biographical interest in Christ is "completely absent, and if we had to rely on the "*Didache* alone, Jesus of Nazareth might never "have been crucified."[1] In the *Didache* there is represented an early tendency to stereotype both the ethical precepts of Jesus and the Christian ritual. Even our own age has not always advanced far enough beyond the conception of the ultimate sanction for conduct contained in the *Didache*. Our age rings with the fervent conviction that the principles of Jesus Christ must be applied, as we say, to social conditions and must govern all social and individual responsibilities. We think indeed of Christ's words, not as mechanical rules, but as principles which it is our duty to interpret and to apply. It is, however, no effective answer to a merely mechanical and literal interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount, to assert that our Christian duty lies, not in mechanical obedience to the letter, but in thoughtful application of the spirit of the Christian law. We need to go as far and as deep in our interpretation of the historical Christ as the Fourth Evangelist has done. He adds few ethical sayings of Jesus to the traditional stock, yet he does much more than subsume everything under the

1. F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History*, p. 272.

universal law of love. Concerned to delineate clearly what love really is, as seen in the Person of Jesus Christ, he holds that Love ultimately consists in doing the will of God; it is not an emotion in the first place, but an attitude towards God. Jesus does not teach primarily the brotherhood of man, but the Fatherhood of God; our attitude towards our fellows is ultimately determined by our attitude towards God. In the Fourth Gospel this great ethical truth is continually brought into prominence. Everywhere throughout the Gospel Jesus is depicted as above all concerned to do, not His own will, but the will of God. In the Lazarus' story, Jesus is urged by the claims of a very tender human love to exercise immediately His healing power and go at once to the sick man. Instead, He delays, that He may ascertain whether it is the will of God that He should thus expose Himself to death at Jerusalem;[1] the Father's will and not even His own loving desire, is the paramount motive. This majestic picture of One who came not to do his own will but the will of Him that sent him—so often inadequately described as an attempt to present a dogmatic view of Jesus in contrast to the humanity of the Synoptic picture—is not merely a contribution to theology, and a foundation for the belief in the "sinlessness" of Jesus; if we go deep enough, we shall find that this picture is also a great contribution to Christian ethics. Many social

1. pp. 226 ff.

problems and many problems of individual conduct would be quickly settled if we realised that to leave them, either to the fortuitous instincts and intuitions of enlightened Christian consciences and compassionate hearts, or to the mere exercise of Christian organisation and statesmanship, is only to perpetuate them. The solution must be found in the ascertainment by the individual and by the community of the will of God concerning human life. The Evangelist exhibits this method as rooted in and motived by the consciousness of the historical Jesus. Even Jesus has to discover the will of God as occasion arises. The obedient children of God in this world are born not of hereditary example—of blood—neither of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of the will of God, incarnate in humanity. We need not, therefore, be surprised to find the historical fact of the Incarnation—that unbroken God-consciousness which was its truest expression—used in the Fourth Gospel as a moral dynamic. It is in the loving will of God that human love finds its only source of inexhaustible moral energy, its only motive for unwearied moral enterprise. Religion is always assumed by the Hebrew to be the sanction for all acts of righteousness, and the assumption is carried over into the Christian faith, in accordance with Our Lord's own consciousness. Even in the Synoptics, Jesus has sometimes to question the demands of natural compassion, if they at any time seemed to lead Him

beyond the sphere appointed by the will of God: "I am not sent save unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." "The Lord's disciples went not "forth as preachers of morality, but as witnesses "of his life, and of the historic resurrection which "proved his mightiest claims. Their morality is "always an inference from these, never the fore-"front of their teaching. They seem to think that "if they can only fill men with true thankfulness "for the gift of life in Christ, morality will take "care of itself."[1] The Fourth Evangelist's concern that Christian morality should be free and should have an historical basis in the consciousness of Jesus, is shewn in the continual prominence He gives to the conception enshrined in the words: "I am come not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me."[2]

1. Gwatkin, *Early Church History*, I, p. 54. cf. Warde Fowler, *Religious Experience of the Roman People*, p. 471, note 35.

2. "From the Gospel according to John we may learn what "His followers declare to be the real significance of His life. It "is the great charm of Christianity that its innermost doctrine is "incarnate in the person of its Founder, rather than crystallised "into a set of propositions or ordinances. The propositions and "the ordinances may be necessary deductions; one of them, as "we have seen, forms the ground idea of the Fourth Gospel. But "they are exhibited in actions like the laws of Nature themselves. "The doctrines of Christianity are human deductions from the "course of events." Burkitt, *The Gospel History*, pp. 284 f.

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORIAN

1. The Gospel of Experience.

The Fourth Gospel is pre-eminently the Gospel of Christian experience. It has already been pointed out that it is erroneous to exclude a distinct element of reflection and experience in the Synoptic Gospels, but it is also true that the method of the Fourth Evangelist shews a remarkable advance upon these. I believe that reflection and experience are, for the first time in the literature of our religion, consciously and deliberately expressed in artistic fashion, in order to provide a portrait of Jesus suitable to the needs of contemporary thought, and capable of appealing to the mind of the Graeco-Roman world. Reflection in the Synoptic Gospels is largely instinctive, and rather follows lines of development determined by the communities for which they were written, than is the product of a single creative personality. In the Fourth Gospel, the influence of an individual creative personality is very evident. In the statement of his aim in xx, 30, 31, he deliberately sets out to make his own distinctive impression on the mind of a Christian community; for he evidently writes for those who are already Christian, and are feeling the pressure of certain questions

that have arisen from the intellectual and spiritual environment in which they are living. The writer has passed through an experience of his own, as distinctive as Paul's, and we have now to consider the process by which this particular experience has been translated into the written word. What may be called the writer's raw material consists of his own personal experience, the Church's faith, the traditional facts of Christian reminiscence as they are available to him, and the cultural environment of his age. No complete account of the writer's personality, and of the work that is stamped with it, is possible, unless all these aspects are taken into account. The writer's own experience he regards as the work of the Holy Spirit; "I have many things to tell you, but ye cannot bear them now," is a promise that has been fulfilled in his own knowledge. According to the same promise, the Paraclete has "taken of the things of Christ," and declared them; has "glorified" Christ (xvi, 14), or in other words, has taught this disciple to see in Him the Incarnate Word. How shall this Evangelist "unpack his heart with words," and communicate these things to the world?

The method of utterance chosen by the Evangelist is responsible for a kind of literature unique in the New Testament. This Gospel has rightly been called "the first work of art in the New Testament." If, however, we characterise it as the work of a dramatic artist, the description is not intended to

imply on the one hand, that the writer's conception of Christ is, as it were, " made in the house " and owes nothing to direct inspiration; nor on the other hand, that his finished work stands out of all conscious relation to the facts of our Lord's life on earth. The Evangelist has clearly at his disposal, both the Gospels of Mark and of Luke—his knowledge of Matthew being extremely doubtful,—and he seems also to have been acquainted with some tradition of sayings and events other than the Synoptic, and peculiar to himself. If he is dependent on the Synoptic tradition for such stories as the Feeding of the Multitude and the Walking on the Water, the Miracle at Cana and the Raising of Lazarus are clearly derived elsewhere. The problem of historicity raised by the Miracle at Cana is not essentially different from that with which we are confronted in the Synoptic story of the Withered Fig-tree; it is not peculiar to the Fourth Gospel, where however such problems are not essential. The main problem in this gospel is presented in the creative activity of the writer's mind exercised on the raw material of the traditions available to him.

Nowhere else in the New Testament is direct inspiration claimed so definitely as in the Fourth Gospel. In no New Testament writing is there so much said regarding the work of the Spirit on the individual soul, and it cannot be doubted that in what the Evangelist says of the Spirit in the Farewell

Discourses, he is at the same time laying bare the story of the composition of the Gospel. He claims the direct inspiration of the Risen Christ in a fashion that has no parallel since the days of the prophets. The phrase " the Spirit of Truth," and the saying that " the Spirit leads into all the truth," imply a judgment on the value of his own work in the Gospel, which so obviously claims to represent, by means of sayings and deeds of Jesus, the " kingdom of truth." This kingdom of truth or reality is not of this world, but has been manifested within it in the person of the Logos Christ ; an idea directly suggested in the reply of Jesus to Nathanael regarding the " opened heavens." The narratives also reveal fragments of autobiography. Like his own Nicodemus, the writer is one who has been " born again," and has opened his eyes—the wondering eyes of a child with more than a child's intelligence behind them—upon a great new world of reality. If anyone had sought to question the validity of his conception of Christ and of His work, the Evangelist would, no doubt, have replied in the tones of the man born blind, " One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see." The request of Samaria's daughter, " Give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither all the way to draw," and that of the Galilean hearers, " Evermore give us this bread,"—are cries that were once uttered, in one form or another, from the depths of his own heart. It is for this reason also, that not only the language but the thought of

the Gospel, no matter who speaks, is so monotonous in its similarity. All through there runs the thread of an individual experience.

2. The Beloved Disciple.

Is this insistence on direct inspiration compatible with the theory that the author is at the same time a dramatic artist consciously weaving the material of spiritual experience into a drama whose central figure is Jesus Christ, and in which his own experience of the grace and truth that came by Him, emerges in the words and acts of many of the subordinate figures? It may be felt that to compare the work of an Evangelist with the sculptor's, the poet's, or the dramatist's, is to take from it all authoritative religious value. From a literary standpoint, the dramatic view of life does not necessarily imply that we have therein expressed the real working opinions or creed of the dramatist. Professor Bradley,[1] speaking of Shakespeare, remarks that "it does not "seem likely that outside his poetry he was a very "simple-minded Catholic or Protestant or Atheist, "as some have maintained; but we cannot be "sure . . . that in his works he expressed his "deepest and most cherished convictions on "ultimate questions, or even that he had any." We need labour under no such doubt in our reading of the Fourth Gospel. He has cast his Gospel in

1. A. C. Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 6.

dramatic form, but we need have no more hesitation in regarding it as an expression of his deepest convictions, than when we read, say, Milton's *Paradise Lost*. It would not be legitimate to infer after reading Browning's *Ned Bratts*, or Mr. Masefield's *Everlasting Mercy*, that either of these writers is impressing his own belief in an experience of evangelical religion, in the same sense as John Bunyan, say in *The Life and Death of Mr. Badman*, which suggested Browning's poem. The inspirational value of a religious work of art is independent of its outward form, and is determined by its being a record of an experience through which the writer has himself passed, and which he has not merely imagined. All depends on where the artist has encountered his material—in his own soul, or in some type of religious experience which has appealed to his aesthetic sense. The Evangelist leaves us in no doubt regarding the category to which his own work belongs. Freely as he allows his imagination to work on the content and arrangement of the outward facts, he has accepted full responsibility for his conception of the Person of Christ. He never does so more explicitly or more markedly that when he puts his signature here and there in the picture by speaking of "the disciple whom Jesus loved." Some attempt must, therefore, be made to expound the real significance of these references to a mysterious, unnamed disciple.

It is extremely unlikely that a member of the more intimate circle of Jesus' disciples should have presented the narrative of Jesus' life in the form which it assumes in the Fourth Gospel. The independent assertion made regarding the apostolic authorship in Chapter xxi—usually regarded as an addition by another hand,—and the identification there made of the Apostle John with the Beloved Disciple mentioned in the gospel, can only be interpreted as indicating that some doubt existed as to the apostolic authorship. It was intended to set at rest doubt and perplexity on the question which existed in the Church, and its historical validity can no longer be maintained in view of the evidence that has been accumulated as to the early martyrdom of the Apostle. I shall not enter on the question as to the probable authorship of John the Elder, mentioned by Papias. That hypothesis may be correct, but at the same time it is impossible to doubt that the Evangelist does identify himself in some real fashion with the Apostle, in these references to the Beloved Disciple.

In this connection, however, I would raise the question whether all critics of the Gospel are right in assuming, that where a certain disciple is anonymously referred to, whether as "another disciple," or "the disciple whom Jesus loved," or "the disciple known to the High Priest," the same individual is always meant? I venture to cast some

doubt on this assumption. It is to be noted that in the editorial passage (xx, 2)[1] the description of Peter's companion at the tomb is carefully given as "the other disciple whom Jesus loved," and, there can be little doubt, John, son of Zebedee, is designated. If, however, we turn to the passage, i, 35, we see that at first two unnamed disciples of the Baptist are mentioned, and that the name of only one of them is disclosed, merely because it is necessary to do so, inasmuch as the Evangelist is about to describe his going in search of his brother, Simon Peter. If it be said that unless John, son of Zebedee, is here the unnamed disciple, he is not referred to anywhere at all in the list of disciples in Chapter i, we must remember that the same holds true of James, the other son of Zebedee. Moreover, the difficulty of silence regarding these two is no greater than the difficulty created by the mention later on of Nathanael, whose name occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The Editor[2] in xx, 2, clearly identifies "the other disciple" with John, adding also the designation of him given elsewhere in the Gospel, because he wishes to call attention to the place given this disciple in the Gospel, and at the same time to vindicate Peter's claim to a place, if not superior to his, at all events by his side, as the guarantor of a tradition at least as authentic as the Johannine. The Editor's identi-

1. See pp. 280 ff.
2. *Infra*, pp. 282 f.

fication, however, does not necessarily mean that he has correctly interpreted the reference either in i, 40, or in xviii, 15. Moreover, the "disciple known to the High Priest" may be a different individual altogether from the anonymous disciple in i. 35 ff. Is it likely that the man who was partly responsible for the position of danger in which Peter suddenly found himself, would be put forward as identical with him who is elsewhere idealised as "the disciple whom Jesus loved?" The mention of the particular action here described sounds like a confession of partial accountability for the moral disaster that subsequently happened, and the strong probability is that the Evangelist here actually and directly refers to himself. The reference implies that he was a young man of priestly family, and an aristocrat; also for some time a secret disciple—else how would he have escaped the jibing accusation to which Peter succumbed? A confession of guilt may also underlie the words of xii, 42:—"Many "of the rulers believed on him, but because of the "Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should "be expelled from the synagogue." Other important implications that follow from this interpretation of xviii, 15 have been developed later.[1]

Are we then to deny altogether that the Evangelist makes any reference to himself when he speaks of "the disciple whom Jesus loved?" The position here taken up is that he certainly does

1. cf. pp. 158 ff.

call attention to himself in so far as he desires to indicate the human source of the interpretation of Jesus given in his gospel. This Beloved Disciple is the idealised figure of John, son of Zebedee, to whom the Evangelist himself—as Philemon to Paul —owed "his own soul"; with whom he stood in a relationship similar to that which existed between Paul and Onesimus, "my son whom I have begotten in my bonds." He makes the reference as a guarantee that his Gospel is no mere product of his own religious fancy, but is broad-based on the experience of one who had known, with deepest spiritual insight, the mind and heart of Jesus, and had aroused a kindred experience in the heart of his younger friend. No suggestion is implied that Jesus had shown an affection for one particular disciple which was not accorded to the others; the Evangelist more than once speaks of His love for them all (xiii, 1). The isolation and supremacy accorded to the love of Christ for the Beloved Disciple is the product of the Evangelist's own heart; he speaks of one whose friendship and influence had been the means of his own "second birth," and whose own experience of Christ's love had been to him the dominating influence of his life; he speaks as many might speak of a friend, a teacher, or a parent at the flame of whose faith their own has been kindled. The Evangelist, also, does not leave us without a further and clearer glimpse of that fulness of Christian experience which is described

in the title "the disciple whom Jesus loved." "He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, "and I will love him, and manifest myself unto him." "My Father will love him, and we will come unto "him and make our abode with him." (xiv, 21, 24). It is natural to think that those words are connected in the Evangelist's mind with his thoughts of the Beloved Disciple, the ideal Christian, whom he had seen and known and loved in the person of the Apostle John,—a teacher who had experienced the love of the Father, revealed in the love of Jesus Christ, and in whose heart God in Christ had made His dwelling-place.

Augustine's impassioned and affectionate references to his mother in the "Confessions" may be compared. "Because she was confident that Thou, "who hadst promised the whole, wouldest give what "yet remained, most calmly, and with an heart "full of confidence, she replied to me, she believed "in Christ, that before she departed out of this "life, she should see me a faithful Catholic. "Thus much to me. But to Thee, Fountain of "Mercies, poured she forth more copious prayers "and tears, that Thou wouldest hasten Thy help, "and lighten my darkness, and she hastened the "more eagerly to the Church, and hung upon the "lips of Ambrose, for the fountain of that water "which 'springeth up into everlasting life.'"[1]

1. *Confessions*, vi, 1. (Trans. Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature.)

The following words also, describing part of a conversation with Monica after his conversion are not unsuitable to the mystical experience of the Fourth Evangelist—"We wandered step by step "through all material things, and even the very "heaven whence sun and moon and stars shed "their light upon the earth. And further still we "climbed, in inner thought and speech, and in "wonder of Thy works, and we reached to our own "minds, and passed beyond them, so as to touch "the realm of plenty never failing, where Thou "feedest Israel for ever in the pasture of the truth, "and where life is that Wisdom, by which all "things are made, both those which have been, "and those which shall be; and Itself is not made, "but is now as it was and ever shall be; or rather "in it is neither 'hath been' nor 'shall be,' "but only 'is,' since it is eternal. For 'hath "been' and 'shall be,' spell not eternity."[1] The words of the Prologue—"He was in the beginning "with God. All things were made by him, and "without him was not anything made that was "made . . . As many as received him, to them gave "he power to become the children of God"—are not the fruit of purely intellectual speculation, but the language of a soul that has in mystic flight penetrated to the very centre of a bewildering universe, and has there found the glory of God, "full of grace and truth." The Beloved Disciple has been his

1. *Ibid.*, ix, 10.

guide, in whose friendship the Evangelist first encountered a human soul to whom the promise had been fulfilled, "We will come unto him and make our abode with him."

The references to the Beloved Disciple are made not in order to disclose the authorship, but to assert the validity and reality of the writer's own experience of Christ. In some real fashion, the Apostle John must have deeply influenced his life, and it is inevitable to conclude that he must at one time have been his friend and disciple. The title "the disciple whom Jesus loved" is much more likely to have been applied to the Apostle John by a disciple than by himself. It is not necessary to suppose, as Canon Streeter has lately pointed out, that the author had seen a great deal of John or that more than a small number of facts in the Gospel were derived from him. It is noticeable that most of his facts correspond with the narratives of Mark and Luke, and might be derived from these. "A brief and, as it seemed in the halo of later "recollection, a wonderful connection with the "apostle—perhaps also a few never-to-be-forgotten "words derived from his lips—would make the "attitude towards the Beloved Disciple expressed "in the Gospel psychologically possible."[1] Chapter xxi shews, as has already been said, that considerable doubt existed in certain directions as to the authority of the Fourth Gospel; the Evangelist,

1. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 433.

in some respects, is in the same position as Paul, who had to meet attacks on the authenticity of his message on the ground that he was not a member of the original band of immediate disciples.

The Evangelist, probably knowing the prejudice created in the course of his Ephesian ministry against his presentation of Christ as compared with the Synoptic account, is concerned like Paul, to insist upon his "apostleship," in the sense that he had received his commission direct from the Lord Himself. He has a case even stronger than Paul's; for an Apostle had been his friend and spiritual father, and if the interpretation just given of xviii, 15 ff be accepted, he had been himself an eye-witness at least of much that happened at the Trial. The Evangelist has an individual experience of Christ as vivid and real as Paul's, when he says "Not I, but Christ that liveth in me;" and by his relationship with the Beloved Disciple, and his knowledge of Jesus on earth, he is enabled to identify himself with the earliest Christian community, and to say "*we* beheld his glory." He, too, had seen the Lord. These allusions to "the disciple whom Jesus loved" are at once allusions to himself and to another; to himself, inasmuch as he claims that because Christ loved him, He therefore manifested Himself to him, through the ministry of an older friend who was an apostle, and that his presentation of Christ is

divinely authenticated; to another, inasmuch as he asserts that his presentation is in line with historic testimony, and is based upon it. In a very real sense he was the recipient of a special gift of Divine love. " The painter's explanation applies " here also. It is the truth told lovingly. Details " have been brooded over until new significance " appeared in them, for love is not quickly satisfied "that it has found the adequate word."[1] Yet the Evangelist is always conscious that so long as the personality of the Beloved Disciple remains an integral part of his own life, his Gospel is much more than the product of imaginative brooding upon details given him from without, or the result of the free creative activity of his own mind. His central theme is the historic and actual Incarnation of Jesus Christ, and although his own eyes had missed the apprehension of that glory in the days of Christ's flesh, he can still say " we beheld His glory "; for, as Westcott remarks while commenting on 1 John, i. 1. " The vision and witness of the immediate disciples " remain as an abiding endowment of the living " body." The Evangelist has received his share of that endowment through the friendship and ministry of the Beloved Disciple, and it has become in the crucible of his own soul a vision of Christ all his own. He might have said, as the Samaritan villagers said to the woman: " No longer do we " believe because of thy speaking; for we ourselves

1. W. M. Macgregor, *Repentance unto Life*, p. 141.

"have heard and know that this is indeed the "Saviour of the world."[1]

At the Cross, the Beloved Disciple is represented as receiving into his charge the mother of Jesus (xix, 25–27), and in all probability, it is he also to whom the solemn asseveration regarding the effect of the lance-thrust is assigned (xix, 35). The latter instance is of course intended, not only to shew that the body of Jesus was truly human, but that His death was real.[2] The figure of the mother of Jesus, after the allusive and symbolic fashion of the Evangelist, denotes more than merely an historical person. Here, also, the Beloved Disciple seems to combine in one symbolic figure the personality of the Apostle and of the Evangelist. According to the interpretation of the incident which we seem driven to adopt, the mother of Jesus must be regarded

1. The words of xx, 29, "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed. Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed," cannot be taken as in contrast with those who saw Jesus in the flesh while he was on earth. The word in i, 14 is, "we beheld" (*θεασάμεθα*), as against *ἑώρακας* and *οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες* in xx, 29. Abbott (Johannine Vocabulary 1650) translates *θεασάμεθα* by "contemplated," as distinct from bodily vision. Who are meant by "they that have not seen"? Probably the reference is eschatological. This evangelist evidently regards the appearance to the assembled disciples and to Thomas as taking the place of the apocalyptic vision of the *παρουσία* expected by the early Church (pp. 184 ff); and those for whom the beatitude is intended are the men and women who have received in their hearts the gift of the Holy Spirit, and are able to make the confession of Thomas without the visual assurance of the return of Jesus from death. Among these the Evangelist would include himself. The words are intended to satisfy those who were still looking in vain for the visible *παρουσία* and were tempted to think of their faith as incomplete until this had taken place.

2. See Professor Burkitt's note, *The Gospel History*, pp. 233–4.

as a symbolic figure, denoting the finest spiritual traditions of the race from which Jesus sprang. One shrinks from any interpretation of the story which seems to minimise the tenderness of its moving, human appeal, but we must set the story over against the other references in the Gospel to the mother and brethren of Our Lord.[1]

These references emphasise the disparity of outlook that existed between Our Lord and His family, and the growing cleft between them which is apparent also in the Synoptic Gospels. It is impossible to escape the impression that the mother of Jesus stands for much more than an individual figure in this Gospel. She represents the Jewish race to which Jesus belonged, and symbolises His Jewish origin. This scene where Mary is committed to the charge of the Beloved Disciple must be compared with the scene at Cana, where Jesus says "Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come." The hour has now indeed come. At Cana, the water is Judaistic legalism which is turned into the wine of the Christian faith, but the creative act is not due to any suggestion which arises from the ancient faith itself. Jesus belongs to no single nationality. In the scene at the Cross, however, "the mother of Jesus again "represents the ancient faith—the mother who had "given birth to Christianity—and Jesus commends

1. It has also to be remembered that, in this Gospel, the symbolic use of an incident does not necessarily imply that it contains no historical truth.

"her, as He dies, to the care of 'the Beloved "Disciple.'"[1] The interpretation of Jesus given in the Gospel, is the fulfilment by the Evangelist of the charge handed on to him by his spiritual teacher, "the Beloved Disciple." Jesus "came unto his own, and his own received him not," but yet "salvation is of the Jews"; and when the hour comes, the Beloved Disciple is made the custodian of all that is noblest and greatest in the ancestral faith. This trust is the Evangelist's answer to Paul's agonised question, "Hath God cast off his people?"[2] The scene at the Cross must be taken as the foil to the violent Jewish polemic in the Gospel. All that is best in Judaism finds a place in the teaching of this Evangelist. "The disciple from that hour took her to his own home."

The Evangelist dramatically merges himself in the personality of the older disciple who had been his friend, through whom the real universal significance of Jesus Christ had been made known to him. His love for Christ is at once profound and transfiguring. It makes of him an egoist, but his is the egoism of a supreme humility. He is himself taking a privileged part in the great drama of the crucifixion. With a swift and powerful dramatic instinct, he imagines himself present, realising the meaning of Christ's life and death. He becomes a poet, but his poetry is indeed in Wordsworth's phrase, "truth carried

1. E. F. Scott. *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 74 f.
2. Romans, xi, 1 ff.

alive into the heart by passion."[1] He has apprehended the commission laid upon him and upon all who stand as he did under the shadow of the Cross of which it is said, "I if I be lifted up from the earth will draw all men unto myself." In that claim he heard also a command. The fields are white unto harvest, and the great Husbandman is "thrusting forth" another labourer to the harvest. The whole scene is typical of the spirit in which this nameless Christian missionary—"modernist" inasmuch as he clearly envisages the need of the new world, but is also rooted in the conviction of God's special revelation to His chosen people—sets out to capture by his Gospel the pagan world for Christ.

3. Dead Fact and Living Truth.

The Evangelist, however, is not dependent on the Beloved Disciple for all his material. He tells us that he has made a selection out of the mass of available material, consisting of the information, both written and oral, already in possession of the Church, regarding the life and teaching of Jesus (xx, 30). We may therefore conclude that, on his own testimony, the material on which he draws has encountered his own mind, and has not been produced by it. If we call the Gospel a work of art,

1. The whole passage in Wordsworth's Preface is apt. "The "object [of poetry] is truth, not individual and local, but general "and operative; not standing upon external testimony but "carried alive into the heart by passion; truth which is its own "testimony, which gives strength and competence to the tribunal "to which it appeals, and receives them from the same tribunal." *Preface*, 1800. Knight's Ed. IV, p. 290.

this does not mean that his material bears the same relation to the Gospel as the block of marble to the Zeus of Phidias, or the David of Michael Angelo. It is not an inchoate mass until the sculptor carves it into a statue. The Christ of the Fourth Gospel is no merely statuesque figure, hewn by the imaginative faith of the writer, out of the available tradition. The Evangelist really believed that Jesus appeared to men, had men only had eyes to see, as He appears in this Gospel. Moreover, the inference to be drawn from the statement in xx, 30, " these things " are written that ye may continue to believe that " Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God "—is that certain Christian readers or hearers were perplexed by the form in which the records of their faith had been made known to them, and desired some interpretation of the traditional accounts of the life and sayings of Jesus, which would enable them to meet the demands made by Hellenic forms of thought upon their faith. The Evangelist is himself a Christian who, in obedience to the new environment of thought, has passed the familiar story of events of Our Lord's life and His sayings through the alembic of his own mind.

His Gospel is one in which brooding memory is consciously owned as a creative force. The " remembering " the words and the deeds of Jesus in this Gospel is regarded as more than mere verbal or factual reminiscence; it is the means whereby the full splendour of the earthly life dawned

on the minds of the disciples, and "they beheld his glory."[1] The Evangelist is aware of the part which brooding memory has played in the development of his own faith also;—"Out of his fulness have we all received, and grace upon grace." In these words from the Prologue, "grace" is expressly contrasted with "law." The language is Pauline, but the interpretation given to the terms is wider than Paul's. The Evangelist has known in his own experience that depth upon depth of gracious divine meaning has been unfolded, as in the light of his own needs he pondered the Personality of Jesus. No merely legalistic interpretation of Christ's sayings nor literalistic interpretation of the events of his life, no mere searching for precedents in the conduct or words of Jesus—such as, for example, we find in the *Didache*—is in place. Wordsworth was in the habit of noting down, with the help of his sister Dorothy, impressions and incidents which some years afterwards were worked up into poems. When they appeared thus, they were transformed. The poem contained more and also less than the incident, but not more than the actual happening suggested; where details were dropped, they disappeared either because they would only have done harm to the general artistic effect, or they had slipped from memory. "Poetry" he defines as "emotion recollected in tranquillity," and he tells us that he sometimes drew his poetic material

1. ii, 22; xii, 16; xv, 20; xvi, 4, 21.

from " hiding-places ten years deep."[1] " Nature," he once said in criticism of another poet, probably Scott, " does not allow an inventory to be made of " her charms. He should have left his pencil " behind, and gone forth in a meditative spirit ; and " on a later day, he should have embodied in verse, " not all he had noted, but what he best remembered " of the scene ; and he would then have presented " us with its soul, and not with the mere visual " aspects of it."[2] Some process such as this must have taken place in the mind of the Fourth Evangelist. He has presented us with the soul, and not merely with the visual aspects of the Life on earth. Whoever he was, he was an old man when he wrote, and must have carried events and sayings in the womb of memory for much longer than Wordsworth's decade. He had also been in the habit, no doubt, of preaching much of what was afterwards incorporated in his Gospel.

The concern of the Evangelist, therefore, is not to guarantee the historical truth of events and sayings, but to shew that in these there was contained and suggested a portrait of Jesus which would appeal and indeed, as he had found, did already appeal, to the Hellenistic mind. Our age of antiquarian research and scientific accuracy, however, has produced an attitude towards ancient documents—especially the Bible—which often blinds us to the

1. *Waggoner*, 212.
2. *Quoted* by H. W. Garrod, *Wordsworth*, p. 160.

truth they contain. To ask whether a work is historical is not the same thing as to ask whether it is true. Even facts may lie.

> Lovers of dead truth, did ye fare the worse ?
> Lovers of live truth, found ye false my tale ?
> Well now: there's nothing in nor out o' the world
> Good except truth: yet this, the something else.
> What's this then, which proves good yet seems untrue?
> This that I mixed with truth, motives of mine
> That quickened, made the inertness malleable
> O' the gold was not mine—what's your name for this ? [1]

Biblical criticism must, at all costs, be preserved from becoming a branch of antiquarian research. *The Lord is the Spirit*, as Paul says with fine historical sense and accuracy, and in the later Christian thought, the Spirit was regarded as the supreme witness to the orthodoxy of a belief, and the true guide to its interpretation. The love of truth interpreted solely as historical accuracy, may miss the spirit of great historical events, fail to interpret the principles that gave them birth, and be quite insensitive to the passions that animate the drama of human life.[2]

4.—Does the Evangelist intend to Supplement the Synoptic Gospels?

One aspect of this antiquarian attitude towards the Fourth Gospel is exemplified in the theory that the Evangelist intends to supplement the Synoptic Gospels. This notion must be dismissed, as out of harmony with the attitude of the earliest defenders

1. Browning, *The Ring and the Book*, I, 696 ff.
2. cf. Drummond, *Character and Authorship of The Fourth Gospel*, p. 29.

of the Gospel. There are indeed clear indications that the work of the Synoptic writers is known to him, and here and there he even seems to correct them in matters of detail ;[1] but his Gospel is really intended to meet certain apologetic needs of the Christian Church which had not yet arisen in the *milieu* of the Synoptic writers. Its whole scheme is different, and indeed it may be said to be the only canonical Gospel which is governed by a consistent philosophical idea from beginning to end, namely, the conception of Christ as the Logos. As such it was recognised in the post-apostolic Church, and the idea of supplementing the Synoptic Gospels is not in accordance with the earliest impressions made on the minds of the men who were prominent in the controversy with Gnostic writers, and had to make use of the Four Gospels for this purpose. Papias, apparently, so far as the extant fragments of his work indicate, compares the Fourth Gospel with the Synoptics, and prefers the former as containing the most consistent and authentic account. He is no doubt, as Eusebius suggests, a man " of exceeding mean capacity," by which is meant, probably, that he was a simple and receptive type of believer, whose mind is not given to analysis. The fragments that have been preserved by Eusebius and have been assigned to him are, perhaps, on that account all the more valuable, as mirroring in such

1. iii, 24 ; iv, 54 ; xix, 17. Mark and Luke he certainly knew : his knowledge of Matthew is doubtful. cf. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 408 ff.

a simple mind the nature of the controversy regarding the Gospels, in which the Church was engaged at the beginning of the second century. The controversy did not centre on the question whether the Fourth Gospel should be recognised, but on the dilemma, the Synoptics or John.[1] The heretical writers were drawing attention to the omissions and contradictions in the Synoptic matter. Orthodox writers like Papias urged the completeness of plan in the Fourth Gospel. Papias describes the Marcan Gospel by saying that it contains reminiscences of Peter's preaching, preserved by Mark who was "Peter's interpreter," and "wrote down accurately everything that he "remembered, without, however, recording in "order[2] what was either said or done by "Christ." He means apparently that by its lack of "order," it was not suited for repelling Gnostic attacks. The context shows that Papias is contrasting the occasional character of Mark's Gospel with the "order" of John's Gospel,[3] although he is at pains to make it clear that he does not imply that Mark's facts are in question. "Mark "made no mistake . . .; for he made it his one "care not to omit anything that he heard, nor to

1. Wendland, *Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur*, 3rd Ed., p. 302.

2. By τάξις, not chronological but rhetorical order is meant; there is an ordered thought, in Papias' view, in the Fourth Gospel which is necessarily absent in Mark; for although in the latter the facts are correct, it is based on disconnected reminiscences of Peter's preaching. cf. Zahn, *Introduction*, II, 438

3. Eusebius, III, 39.

"set down any false statement therein." Papias also appears to be comparing Matthew with the Fourth Gospel, and says that Matthew compiled the *Logia*, or sayings, in Hebrew, "and each one interpreted them as he could." His point seems to be that inasmuch as we have to depend on various *translations* of the collection of Jesus' sayings made by Matthew, and there is no authoritative translation, these cannot be more authoritative than the Fourth Gospel. In his reference to Mark he means that Mark's order of events similarly ought not to be preferred to the deliberate arrangement of the Fourth Gospel.[1] Papias evidently regards the Fourth Gospel not only as an ordered whole, but as the earliest of the Gospels, and measured the Synoptics against it.[2] The evidence of Papias is conclusive as proving that in the mind of the Church of his day, the Fourth Gospel was not regarded as a supplement to the Synoptics.

To seek historical accuracy as a guarantee of the value of a writing like the Fourth Gospel is also to misunderstand the conception of history which prevailed in the Evangelist's time. Thucydides concerns himself to report the actual facts of history, but expressly admits that he composed the speeches. "My rule has been to reproduce what "seemed to me the most probable and appropriate "language for each occasion, while preserving as

1. cf. B. H. Streeter, op. cit., p. 19.
2. Schwartz, *Über den Tod der Soehne Zebedaei*, p. 23.

" faithfully as possible the general sense of the speech " actually delivered." (i, 22). Later historians seem to have composed both facts and speeches.[1] History became " a branch not of science but of letters." Lucian compares the historian's business to the sculptor's. He does not " create the gold, silver, ivory or other material used"; his art consists in " the right arrangement " (τάξις) of the material. " The historian's business is similar— " to superinduce upon events the charm of order, " and set them forth in the most lucid fashion he " can manage." Also, the Prologue to the Gospel, which is the clue to the writer's conception of his own work, would pass the test laid down by Lucian for the preface to a historical work : " The way to " secure the reader's attention is to show that the " affairs to be narrated are great in themselves, " throw light on Destiny, or come home to his " business or bosom."[2]

5.—Analogy with the Apocryphal Gospels.

The appearance of a work like the Fourth Gospel, with its free, creative, and imaginative treatment of the story of Jesus and His apostles was not entirely unaccompanied and unheralded. Many apocryphal Gospels were beginning to appear. The Gospel of the Hebrews and the Gospel of Peter are probably

1. cf. Toynbee, *Greek Historical Thought*, p. 217.
2. Lucian, *The Way to write History*, 51, 53 (Translation by H. L. Fowler and F. G. Fowler).

contemporary with the Fourth Gospel, and these two have peculiar affinities with Johannine thought. We may clearly trace certain affinities of style, thought and attitude, between the apocryphal Gospels and the Fourth.[1] Already the process has begun in Matthew and Luke, by which free theological reflection begins more boldly to make itself felt as against the simpler form of Mark's Gospel. The creative activity of dogmatic conceptions in Mark is not altogether absent, but he is predominantly one who transmits and collects traditional material. Luke and Matthew, begin to fill up gaps in Mark from the more or less artistically arranged collection of sayings known as Q, and from their own theological reflection prompted by the need to relate the sayings and doings of Christ to contemporary situations. Luke's preface to his Gospel, moreover, is an indication of that personal note, which indicates a certain freedom and plasticity of thought on the part of an individual writer in relation to the traditional material, which achieves its finest result in the Fourth Gospel. That the Fourth Gospel secured its place in the canon is a tribute to its fidelity to the church's experience and conception of the Risen Christ. The writer's insistence on the fact of the Incarnation, "the word made flesh," as against all attempts made in the apocryphal Gospels to minimise the true humanity

1. cf. Wendland, *Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur*, 3rd. Ed., pp. 293 ff.

of Our Lord, is his original and decisive contribution to the Christian doctrine of the Person of Christ.

At the same time, there are certain characteristics of style in the apocryphal Gospels which suggest that in the matter of external form, they are akin to the Fourth Gospel.[1] There appears in them, for example, a tendency to introduce certain details which have the effect either of rendering the narrative more vivid, or of meeting some contemporary doctrinal difficulty. In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, to quote from a fragment preserved by Jerome, the man with the withered hand is a mason, who appeals for help on the ground that his livelihood is at stake ; at the crucifixion, not only was the veil rent, but a " lintel of the temple of wondrous size fell " ; before the baptism, Jesus' mother and his brethren suggested that He should be baptised by John, and Jesus retaliates that he is not conscious of sin ; in an account of the crucifixion these words are used,—" After they had raised him up on the cross the Father took him up into heaven unto himself."[2] This love of detail might be paralleled in the Fourth Gospel. Martha and Mary have a brother called Lazarus ; Peter is the disciple who struck the blow, and Malchus the name of the man who was wounded ; at the arrest the

1. cf. Drummond, *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 376
2. M. J. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. 1 ff.

soldiers fell back on the ground when Jesus spoke; the act of the baptism of Jesus by John is omitted, and John is made simply a witness of the descent of the spirit as a dove; the introduction of Jesus' "mother and brethren" recalls the place these occupy more than once in the apocryphal gospels; the crucifixion is described as a "lifting up" of Jesus, and there is a peculiar mention of the Ascension in Chapter xx.[1] The Fourth Evangelist introduces the story of the breaking of the legs of the criminals, but Jesus is not so treated because He is already dead; thereby additional symbolic proof is given that Jesus is the paschal lamb. The Gospel of Peter, on the other hand, relates that the legs of the impenitent malefactor were not broken, in order that he might die in torment as a punishment for his defiance of Jesus. In the Synoptic Gospels there is a growing tendency to present Pilate in a more favourable light, and to represent him as testifying to the innocence of Jesus. This tendency reaches its climax in the Fourth Gospel, and in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter.

6.—"Historical Sermons" and "Alien Fragments."

It is now one of the commonplaces of the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels to recognise the alterations made upon certain sayings recorded in Mark, in Matthew and Luke, for reverential or doctrinal

1. pp. 305 ff.

reasons. Chief among these are the sayings, " Why callest thou me good ? " or " Master, carest thou not that we perish ? " as reproduced in Matthew and in Luke. The whole process of so presenting the portrait of Jesus as to keep pace with the growing and deepening religious experience of the church begins even in the Marcan portrait, with its representation of Jesus as Son of God, and as wielding a mastery over the demon-world—a mastery which, in its conception, goes far beyond the idea of a Divine physician. The same process is seen to culminate in the Fourth Gospel with its indentification of Jesus with the Divine Logos. The Fourth Gospel is not such an isolated phenomenon as is sometimes supposed.

The Fourth Evangelist clearly uses the historical traditions available to him as a kind of transparent medium through which there appears the reaction of faith and unbelief on the person of Jesus Christ. The method of writing pictorial history in the form of " historical sermons " was a familiar Jewish method. In later Judaism large stretches of the Old Testament historical books were interpreted in this way, for example the stories of Elijah and Elisha. The method was known as *Haggadah*, a homily founded on portions of the sacred history, and carried through by an allegorising of the stories. At the same time there is no interest on the part of the Haggadists to suggest that the stories with which they operated were historically

untrue.[1] The practice of *Haggadah*, however, is not a complete explanation of the literary character of the Fourth Gospel. It contains much more than *Haggadah*. There is a dramatic freedom in the creation of scenes and in the development of dialogue, which indicates that the author's mind is working apart altogether from any conscious adherence to details of fact. He is not working with written documents before him, but is drawing from scenes reconstructed in his mind out of traditional material and present to his own vision. Therein he differs from the Haggadists; for it is plain that Philo, for example, when he allegorises the stories of the Old Testament is actually "reading between the lines" of a book. To say that the scenes and words recorded by this Evangelist thus bear the marks upon them of the writer's creative imagination, does not necessarily mean either that he is indifferent to history, or that he is deliberately and consciously recording what he does not believe to be true. The Evangelist's main purpose is to make it clear, as against the Gnostic position, that the world of fact was indeed used as a medium of Divine Revelation, wherein "the Word became flesh."[2]

In accordance with this purpose, it may well be

1. "The persons of the Bible . . . became, apart from their "presupposed historical reality, a symbol and an allegory. And "what the narrative had omitted the Haggadah applied in many "variations. It filled up these gaps, as a prophet looking into the "past might do; it explained the motives; it enlarged the story." Deutsch, *Literary Remains*, p. 45 (quoted Drummond, *Character and Authorship*, p. 31).

2. cf. B. H. Streeter, op. cit., p. 388.

that in this Gospel many of the vivid details of time and place, usually described as the marks of an eye-witness and therefore matter-of-fact, are really the work of a lively dramatic imagination. It is well-nigh impossible to think that the intense human interest of the dialogue with the woman of Samaria, where there were neither eye-witnesses nor auditors, and in which both Our Lord and the woman herself speak in the same parabolic and allusive fashion, can be other than a dramatic introduction to the story of the Samaritan mission that follows. The woman, however vividly conceived—with her banter, her religious prejudices, and probably even her five husbands,—is the incarnation of the Samaritan spirit towards all things Jewish. Her five husbands may well stand for the five books of the Pentateuch which were all of the Old Testament recognised by the Samaritans; or as has been suggested, for the worship of the five gods imported into Samaria by the Assyrian king as described in II Kings, xvii, 24–41. There was no doubt some incident in the traditions before him that suggested the situation to the Evangelist. The woman is certainly a life-like figure, but in her mouth is placed a kind of ecclesiastical discussion which is too logical and inevitable in its sequences to be quite consonant with bare historical reality.

There are indications that the Evangelist, in applying his dramatic imagination to the material that encounters it, has found it to be in some cases

intractable,[1] offering resistance to the fusing influence of his own creative and poetic power. Its "inertness" is not "malleable"[2] in Browning's phrase, and defies the quickening motions of the writer's mind. A striking instance is seen in the account of the controversy about Sabbath-breaking that arose out of the healing of the man at Bethesda. The Sabbath controversies in Chapters v and vii are true to the contemporary historical circumstances under which they are reported to have taken place; but they are speedily merged in a deeper controversy about the Person of Jesus and His Divine relationship. The transition is indeed natural and logical in view of such a Synoptic saying as "The Son of Man is lord also of the Sabbath," of which the Johannine discourse is an expansion, with controversies in view that were contemporary with the date at which the Gospel was written.[3] This emergence of his traditional material when, as always in the discourses, the creative genius of the author is most powerfully evident, is at the same time good evidence of an accurate acquaintance on the part of the author's sources with the Palestinian situation. On the other hand, it is difficult to think that these

1. cf. Ed. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christenthums, III*, pp. 320 ff.

2. *The Ring and the Book*, I, 702.

3. The Johannine saying "My Father worked hitherto and I work," in its lofty claim, does not really go beyond the Synoptic utterance above quoted, but provides a more natural transition to the main theme of the discourse, which is really the Divine Sonship of Jesus. cf. p. 178.

blocks of original material which appear both in the narrative and doctrinal portions of the Gospel, in themselves indicate any first-hand acquaintance on the writer's part with the life or teaching of Jesus.

Another instance where the traditional material obtrudes itself, and is only partially fused in the writer's creative imagination is found in the story of the Cleansing of the Temple. It is suggested elsewhere that this story is inserted where it stands, in order to serve the ideal purpose of the Evangelist.[1] Special interest attaches to the saying, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." The utterance is undoubtedly historical, for it appears as part of the evidence at the trial of Jesus, and its real meaning cannot be mistaken. On the lips of Jesus it actually meant that the Christian community is founded on personal faith, and not on the existence of a traditional ritual; Jesus is uttering in another form the prophetic antagonism to ritual as an essential of religious life. Elsewhere He quotes, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," with approval; and on the rock of Peter's faith and all such-like faith "I will build my church." The Evangelist has given the saying a significance pointing to the Resurrection,—"He spake of the temple of his body," and has thereby given to Our Lord's words a meaning which does not agree with the sense which really belonged to them and made them liable to such a revolutionary

1. pp. 85 ff.

interpretation of them as was offered at His trial. The real significance of the words used is expressed in Matthew xii, 6, "One greater than the temple is here," which is followed by the prophetic quotation already referred to, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." The Evangelist's use of this saying, and his interpretation of it as pointing forward to the Resurrection—which it of course implies—is an example of what is meant by saying that he finds here and there his raw material intractable. "The disciples," he says, "remembered that Jesus was (all the while) speaking of his rising from the dead," and again in the comment on the actual utterance, he says, Jesus "was (all the while)[1] speaking of the temple of his body." The use of this particular saying, however, even if the Evangelist's interpretation is here at fault, shews at least that he allows himself no unwarrantable liberty in dealing with traditional sayings of Jesus, and that all the time he is concerned to interpret the actual utterances of Jesus of Nazareth.

Other examples of the resistance of the original material to the writer's imagination in the narrative portions of the work may be found. The saying, "Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come," in the story of the marriage at Cana, arouses a certain surprise which is not caused merely by the apparent harshness of the words. The charge of harshness is really irrelevant,

1. Imperfect tense. cf. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, 2469.

because the words are only in line with the emphasis which the Evangelist places on the breach between Our Lord and His family,[1] in obedience to the pragmatic method he employs throughout his work. The occurrence of the saying surprises us because it seems to have no real connexion, either with what precedes or with what follows. The logical connexion is in the writer's own mind, and arises out of the conception that Our Lord does not enter upon his ministry on any human suggestion, or in obedience merely to any call of human need, or at the bidding of human affection. The saying does not present itself as an integral part of the narrative. Again, consider the Evangelist's treatment of the Baptism. He is acquainted with the Synoptic account where Our Lord Himself sees the descent of the dove. In the Johannine account, this vision belongs to the Baptist alone. To him it is a sign of the divine sonship of Jesus, not as in the Synoptics an experience of Jesus, in which He first becomes conscious of His divine vocation. The dove is a symbol of what is already there. It not only descends but "abides." The descent is only a recognition from heaven of the abiding sonship of Jesus, and is a signal to the Baptist alone. "I knew Him not," the Baptist says. No act of the Baptist meant the conferring upon Jesus of any fresh endowment. It will be felt that the Evangelist here is consciously adapting the traditional story,

1. cf. pp. 197 ff.

and that the material in which he works partially refuses to conform to the writer's purpose.[1] We may compare the vision promised to Nathanael and his friends (i, 51). The divine ministry is a permanent accompaniment from the very outset of Jesus' appearance among men. Other similar illustrations of the intractability and protrusion of traditional material is found in the mention of the Ascension in xx, 17, and in the interweaving of the Lazarus figure with the household at Bethany.[2]

The non-malleable nature of the material out of which the Gospel is composed is perhaps more clearly seen in certain portions of the discourses. Attention has been called to this aspect of the Johannine Gospel by Professor E. F. Scott.[3] The personality of the Fourth Evangelist is everywhere felt, and the traditional doctrines of the Christian Church of his day were not merely known to him as external traditions, but had a living place in his own Christian experience. There can be no doubt that "nonconformist" as many of the utterances in the Gospel and in the Johannine Epistles are—there is undoubtedly an element of opposition in the Johannine thought to sacramentalism (Chapter vi) and ecclesiastical tyranny (Chapter x)—the experience of this writer, which is shared by

1. The suggestion of Ed. Meyer, *op. cit.* (p. 323) that the Evangelist implies that here the Incarnation takes place, is impossible.
2. cf. p. 234.
3. *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 9, 118, 216, 219, 249, 308, 348, 357.

the Christian community of his day, and his habit of expressing that experience in traditional forms of thought, have led him to retain certain expressions which do not by themselves convey his own belief, but are really forms in which the mind of the Church rather than the individual thinker, finds utterance. Examples of this kind may be found in v, 28, 29; "All that are in their graves, shall hear his voice . . . to a resurrection of judgment"; and in the utterances regarding the Second Advent in Chapters xv and xvi. Reference will later on be made to the doctrine of the Ascension which underlies xx, 17.[1] "Again and again," says Professor E. F. Scott, "we meet with isolated "ideas which cannot be reconciled with the character-"istic Johannine thought. They can only be regarded "as fragments of the earlier doctrine that have simply "been taken over without any, or with a very "imperfect attempt at assimilation." He rejects the notion that these alien fragments are—"con-"cessions made by the Evangelist to current modes of "belief." This account of them, he adds, is scarcely adequate; a thinker who is reaching forward to a larger conception of truth does not break entirely with the common beliefs of his age; even when they clash with his own belief he is not himself fully conscious of the opposition, and still allows room for them in his scheme of thought, although in spirit he has transcended them. "John," says

1. pp. 305 ff.

Professor Scott, "concedes no doctrine which he "does not himself share with the primitive Church, "but many of the doctrines thus taken over from "the earlier time have ceased to be vital to him. "They are incorporated in his work without in "any way modifying its inward character."[1]

At this point I would like to bring forward a criticism of one aspect of Professor Scott's interpretion of this Evangelist's attitude towards the primitive doctrines of the Christian community. Professor Scott's words are that "he concedes no "doctrine which he himself does not share with "the primitive Church, but many of the doctrines "thus taken over from the earlier time have ceased "to be vital to him." Is "vital" the just word here? It is not surprising that the thought of most of those "alien fragments" of the primitive faith should centre around the conception of Christ as Judge, and of His Return in power and glory; for these conceptions are securely founded in the consciousness of Jesus Himself. Their reappearance in the Johannine Gospel, intended as it is for Hellenistic readers, is not astonishing if we realise that, while their traditional *formal* expression had ceased to be vital to the writer, and to the community which he addressed, their essence was a living part of permanent Christian experience. Jesus had already returned in the form of His *alter ego*, the Holy Spirit.[2]

1. E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 10.
2. pp. 317 ff.

The Evangelist retains here and there, it is true, fragments of the conventional eschatological language, but does he not allow his mind to operate in much the same way as Euripides when he introduces the divine and heroic figures of conventional Greek drama? Euripides had indeed a sceptical mind, and probably a certain external compulsion from his audience urged him to retain those figures. It would, however, be untrue to say that he would have swept them aside, had he been free to do so, in order to appeal to men and women whose experience moved in a very different kind of world from his own. In the time of Euripides, the crowd of conflicting gods tended to be supplanted by physical agencies, and men were delivered from gross materialism and rigid determinism only by the faith that one Intelligence controlled all matter. This larger and purer faith is clearly suggested in Euripides, but he never breaks outright with orthodoxy. The reason is, not that he desires to make concessions to popular taste, or is afraid of it, but " that by poetic instinct " if not by reason, he was closely wedded to the " forms inherited from the past; that his imagina- " tion clung to them with peculiar fondness; and " that divorced from them, his genius would have " been changed beyond all forms of recognition. " What is assumed to be mere accident is, in fact, " of the very essence of his tragedies. It supplied " the romance, the craving for something remote

" from familiar experience, which was, I believe, " one of the dominant notes of his temperament, " alike as dramatist and as poet." [1] The foregoing is an estimate of a religious attitude which *mutatis mutandis*, might be applied to the Fourth Evangelist also. He, too, retains those more primitive conceptions because his imagination is wedded to them. He selects more or less instinctively the forms of doctrinal expression he uses, as he selects the details of the traditional narratives that best suit his ideal purpose; yet he takes a great deal less than he leaves. The doctrine of the Parousia, or of the Ascension, or of the Empty Grave, is not, in the Fourth Gospel, the same as in the Synoptics or in the primitive preaching, although the older forms in which they are clothed are comparatively unchanged. This is neither deliberate concession to orthodox opinion, nor have the doctrines ceased to be vital to this Evangelist. Even in our own day, it has been found as yet impossible to improve upon the credal forms in which the doctrine of the Second Advent, or the Final Judgment, is clothed. Jesus Christ as the World-Saviour returning to claim his own in power and glory—Jesus Christ as Judge of men—are doctrines that, while the progress of thought and morality may have profoundly deepened their content, and broadened their significance, are still vital to the Christian faith. The Fourth Evangelist knows that the present

1. C. E. Vaughan, *Types of Tragic Drama*, pp. 77 f.

reality of Christ, the Holy Spirit, does not exclude faith in that day when He shall appear, and we shall be like Him, and shall see Him as He is.

The permanent value of the Fourth Gospel resides in its vitality, and in its power of communicating that vitality to men in all ages. It is alive with that Eternal Life which is its constant theme. It preserves and treasures up, with the purpose of communicating a life beyond life, the very life-giving essence of the Spirit of Christ. " God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son "—are these words not more arresting and life-giving when they are heard as the utterance of a man voicing the conviction of a community, out of whose experience of Christ for two generations they blossomed? Let us remind ourselves again that Jesus wrote nothing, and was content to entrust Himself and the fortunes of His Kingdom to the affections and minds of His friends; promising also that in so far as they " abide in Him," they will never be permitted to wander from the Truth. To trust the creative experience of the Fourth Evangelist, is to trust the work of the living Christ in a human mind, which He has taught to believe that as the environment of men is ever shifting and ever widening, so there is in the Christian Gospel an eternal power of self-adjustment to meet the shifting emphases of the times, and to cover the widening expanse of human need. It is the voice of a Christ great enough to be the Saviour of the World.

CHAPTER III

IS THE GOSPEL A LITERARY UNITY?

1. The Ideal Plan.

The question of the literary unity of the Fourth Gospel can no longer be summarily dismissed, under Strauss's figure of the seamless robe. Investigations such as those of Spitta, Wellhausen, Wendt, Bacon, Garvie, and others have opened up the problem afresh. The treatment of the problem here suggested owes much, needless to say, to these previous discussions.

The hypothesis now presented rests on the general position that, in the Gospel as it stands, there are apparently two disparate plans of construction. On the one plan, the incidents and discourses of the Gospel are grouped according to what might be called an ideal or logical arrangement,[1] whereby the narratives and discourses not only in themselves reflect ideas about the Person of Jesus, but are grouped so as to illustrate certain aspects of faith in Him. This is the plan that governs the form and arrangement of what may be called the Johannine material (J). Another plan has been superimposed on this, a chronological one, which

1. cf. the remarks on Papias' use of the word τάξις, on pp. 65 f.

has for its object to give a historically connected form to the Gospel. Its author may be denominated R (Redactor). The aim of R may be conceived as an attempt to produce a Gospel which shall be more in harmony with that biographical and chronological form, which to him is consonant with a Gospel. It is a plausible conjecture that R's purpose may have been to produce a Gospel arranged and edited so as to be available for reading in public worship.[1] Whether R is identical with the author of the Appendix (Chapter xxi) is matter for discussion.

In order to illustrate the grouping of events and sayings in the Gospel, and to shew that the real development of thought is not determined according to mere historical or chronological arrangement, we may take as a starting-point what I regard as the most significant use of an incident in the Gospel—the Cleansing of the Temple. In the diagnosis of disease the symptoms may, for a time, be those that indicate one or other of two diseases. The two sets of symptoms seem to run for a period in parallel lines, until at length a certain symptom appears which is decisive. Here the lines cross one another, and in the phrase of the old physicists, we have the "crucial" instance, the *instantia crucis*. The Cleansing of the Temple, narrated at the very beginning of the ministry, is, it seems to me, a

1. cf. A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 211, n. 3 (Vierte Auflage).

" crucial instance " in determining the attitude of the Fourth Evangelist to his narrative. Either the story may be treated as an incident inserted in its proper place, and it may be held that there are two cleansings: or it may be assumed that there was some special reason, other than historical, for inserting the story where it stands. The second hypothesis is here adopted. Unless we are to despair of the historical accuracy of the Synoptic record, the Cleansing is there introduced as the act which precipitated the final crisis. In the Synoptic record it stirs the smouldering enmity into a blaze; in the Fourth Gospel it provokes only a mild protest. Why then should it be introduced here at all? I would suggest that its introduction is not only a key to the Evangelist's order in narrative, but affords an important clue to his symbolic usage of all the narrative portions of his Gospel. The insertion of the incident where it stands is deliberate. It is introduced for the sake of the interpretation to which a certain famous saying of Jesus—" Destroy this temple "—imbedded in the traditional narrative before the Evangelist, lends itself. The saying itself is also an epitome of the spiritual significance of the whole incident, the destruction of the old ecclesiastical order and the coming of the new. It will be noticed that in the course of the short, sharp controversy that follows the story in the Gospel, the saying is interpreted by the Evangelist as a prophecy of the Resurrection, and of all that is

involved in the Resurrection—"He spake of the temple of his body." Apart from its use at the trial, it is recorded in its historical setting only in the Fourth Gospel. The nearest Synoptic approach to its meaning is Matt. xii, 6, "One greater than the temple is here," where the context is the claim to supersede ritual observance in the cause of humanity. Probably this is the original significance of the saying, which is not primarily a prophecy of the Resurrection as the Evangelist desires it to be understood., The Resurrection, however, made possible its fulfilment, and the Resurrection fills all the Evangelist's mind at the moment. He wishes to emphasise the faith it produced. He seeks to bring into prominence a certain stage in the growth of faith in Jesus in the hearts of the disciples. "When, therefore, He was raised from the dead, "His disciples remembered that He spake this: "and they believed the scripture, and the word "that Jesus had said."

It is to be noted that from i, 35, right on to ii, 22, the growth of faith in Jesus is the dominant note. Particular attention may be directed to i, 50, 59; ii, 11; ii, 22. Each of these verses marks a stage of faith, and the stages seem to be in an ascending scale. In the first passage, Nathanael believes in Jesus because He saw him under the fig-tree, and had by a marvellous insight divined that he was a man who had secret, spiritual struggles in the privacy of his own home, of which he could

speak to none. The great variety of ways is also to be noticed in which the disciples severally came to Jesus—through the ministry of the Baptist, through the influence of a brother or a friend, through a chance-meeting. In all these cases an instantaneous result follows, and they become disciples of Jesus. He had by one way or another found a place in their hearts. They loved Him for what He had done personally for each of them. Of their faith, Jesus says that faith bounded by individual personal experience of the historical Christ is only a first stage. "Because I said unto "thee, I saw thee under the fig-tree, believest thou? "Thou shalt see greater things than these." Notice how the singular is suddenly changed to a plural in the words that follow, as though the words were addressed in the first place to them all, and through them to the Christian Church. "Verily, verily, I "say unto you (plural), ye shall see the heaven "opened (the perfect tense indicates a meaning "that may be expressed as 'opened and remaining "open'), and the angels of God ascending and "descending upon the Son of Man." In other words, they shall see the abiding, gracious ministry of the Father in the earthly ministry of His Son —"the solemn parting of the clouds of divine providence" displayed that men "may gaze into the mystery beyond." Jesus is the ladder on which the angels of God ascend from, and descend upon the life of men. It is a summary of the significance

of the whole earthly ministry followed by the permanent ministry in heaven. The appearance of an angel of God to an individual in the Old Testament as, for example, to Hagar, is the beautiful Jewish way of describing special acts of divine providence. In Jesus, there is a continuous and universal ministry of God to men. The Word has become flesh, a permanent revelation, open to all who have faith and at all times. Jesus is not only Jacob's, but humanity's ladder, the "living way," by which God and man have mutual access to one another.

In ii, 1-10, we have a typical instance of the exercise of this wider ministry. It may be said in passing that the miracle is probably selected—out of the traditional material at the Evangelist's disposal—for its symbolic significance, and that there is an allusiveness in the turning of water into wine. Is it the turning of the water of Jewish ceremonial religion into the wine of the Christian Gospel?

However that may be, it is important to note that Jesus is not represented as taking a guest's part at the feast, though He is bidden as a guest. He is behind the scenes, in the kitchen as it were, unobtrusively exercising His ministry of compassion, saving the face of an unknown host. None knew who had provided the wine, save the servants, not even the disciples. Jesus remains in humble obscurity. Moreover, it is stated in ii, 2, Jesus manifested His "glory," His "character,"

showed who He was ; that on grounds like these His disciples believed on Him. As yet, however, theirs was a faith founded on the facts of the earthly ministry, and especially on the "signs" interpreted as " miracles," and therefore not yet a perfect faith.

Thus we reach the crowning stage of faith in ii, 22, the Resurrection-faith. " They believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said." To " believe the scripture " is to realise the meaning of prophecy, to see Jesus foreshadowed in prophecy. That, in modern language, was equivalent to saying that Jesus was the fulfilment of the world's hope, and that His coming was in accordance with the eternal laws that govern the universe. Jesus' life and mission were " no Divine freak or caprice," to quote Professor Burkitt, " but a part of a well-ordered whole." " To the pious Jew, the utterances " of the Prophets had very much the same place in " their idea of the world as what we call the Laws " of Nature have for us." [1] It is the special purpose of the Gospel of Matthew to display Jesus as the fulfilment of prophecy, and although we may dissent from some of the interpretations the First Evangelist puts on individual prophecies, his method is already an approach to giving Jesus that cosmic significance which He has in Paul and in the Johannine Gospel. The latter says that the climax of faith is reached when the disciples " believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said." To

1. *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 201.

the Evangelist, Jesus is much more than the fulfilment of Jewish prophecy, or the foreshadowings of the law. He is—even in his passing "words"—the fulfilment of all that *Logos* stood for in the popular philosophy of the Hellenistic world.

Thus in that section of the Gospel which we have been considering we have three stages of faith, three ascending stages, illustrated by various traditional incidents in the history of Jesus and His disciples.

(1) Faith based upon an immediate personal experience.

(2) Faith based on observation and experience of the outward ministry of Jesus.

The incident described in ii, 1-11 may be taken as a "typical"[1] miracle. It is characteristic or typical, first, because the working of Jesus takes place in the background, and, secondly, because it is a creative miracle. It is accomplished by His "word" alone. The "glory" of it is apparent only to those who have eyes to see. "Glory" is the Evangelist's term for the inward personal Divine character of Jesus, revealed in His life here below (i, 14). It shone through His words and deeds on earth, and only after the Resurrection, when Jesus was "glorified," was it fully available for the world in the gift of the Spirit. (vii, 39). Such a vision of His "glory"

1. Origen in his Commentary (Ed. Brooke, i. p. 196) so interprets ἀρχὴ in ii, 11; not first in point of time, but first in significance.

or "character" only gradually unfolded itself as the disciples followed Him, not only through the cities and villages, but, to borrow with Dr. T. R. Glover a phrase of Wordsworth's, "in all the fluxes and refluxes" of His thought. The silent, unobtrusive gracious ministry of God was revealed. Heaven was open, according to the promise to Nathanael.

(3) The full Resurrection Faith. The Resurrection is the beginning of a spiritual ministry which is the satisfaction of the whole world's longing and need, in the eternal purpose of God. The "Logos" has become flesh. The Resurrection has set this "incarnation" free for all men The Resurrection faith is no longer dependent on the fact that Jesus is present in the flesh among men, and actually at work before their senses.

That J's purpose is not primarily biographical but religious and ideal, he really tells us himself in xx, 30 ff, where he says that he made a selection, for this particular purpose, out of a large amount of other material that was available. His words in xx, 30, that he had "many other signs" at his disposal, seem to be not only an apology for reserve, but also a frank statement that his purpose is not biographical. His positive aim has been, by means of the use of a particular series of events in Jesus' life, and of His utterances, to produce a living faith in Him in the hearts of his readers. It may be that his readers are already Christian, and that the expression "that ye may believe" (πιστεύητε)

may therefore indicate by the present tense of the verb (as in vi, 29; xiii, 19; xvii, 21), that the faith aimed at is a continuous or progressive faith; one that will grow, under the pressure of circumstances and the influence of the Holy Spirit, in depth, strength, and insight.[1] In any case, the aim is that the readers may have that faith in Jesus for which He himself prayed, and for which His Evangelists laboured.

We shall, therefore, be prepared to find that "faith" or "belief" is a dominant idea in the Fourth Gospel. One point, however, is deserving of notice. The noun "faith" (πίστις), as has often been observed, is never used in the Gospel. The verb "to believe" alone is found. That can only indicate that the Evangelist conceives of faith as dynamic, and not as static; as a relationship between God and man, through Jesus Christ, which is either tragically conspicuous by its absence, or grows and deepens with increasing knowledge of Jesus Christ, the great object of faith. Not faith in the abstract, but "faith," belief in action, examples of believing faith, varieties of faith illustrated in actual persons and incidents—these together with their opposites, unbelieving hostility and rejection, are the themes of the Fourth Gospel. There is a more or less formal arrangement of incidents and discourses in the Gospel, illustrating different phases, stages, and kinds of faith. The

1. cf. E. A. Abbot, *Johannine Grammar*, 2526-29.

scheme of the Gospel is so conceived that every incident is an historical sermon on the growth or failure of faith, and every discourse has hardly any other theme.

If the analysis that has been made of the passage i, 35–ii, 22, be accepted, we have a key to the construction of the Gospel. Its order is determined by the march of ideas and not of the historical facts. All the outstanding incidents made use of therein,—Nathanael under the fig-tree (preceded by the call of the various disciples), the turning of Water into Wine, the Cleansing of the Temple, have a particular symbolic appropriateness. We shall find that the same ideal plan determines the order of the incidents recorded in the remainder of the Gospel up to Chapter xx.

The following analysis of the Gospel may be suggested, as showing how this ideal development of thought may be verified all through.

DIVISION I. CHAPTERS I—XII.

1. The General Theme, described in the Prologue 1^{1-18}. The Jesus of the Fourth Gospel is the Logos, the Word, the complete manifestation of God the Father.

2.—The Growth of Faith and of Unbelief—1^{19}–12^{36}.

(i) Types of personal Faith in Jesus, illustrated by the attitudes of individuals towards the historical Jesus, 1^{19}–4^{54}.

1. The Baptist, $1^{6-8, 15, 19-35}$. (3^{22-30} may also be included under this head.) A subordinate aim of the Gospel was to prove that Jesus, and not the Baptist, was Messiah.[1] Cf. 3^{30-36}.[2]
2. The Disciples. A description of the growth of faith in the Apostolic circle. 1^{35}–2^{22}.
3. Nicodemus—the Pharisee. Faith as Regeneration, 3^{1-21}.
4. The Woman of Samaria; the Nobleman of Capernaum—Examples of Faith outside the Jewish nation, 4^{44-54}.

(ii.) The Conflict between Faith and Unbelief, illustrated by events connected with the public Ministry of Jesus, and by discourses arising out of them. 5^{1}–12^{36}.

1. Developed under a Series of Topics 5^{1}–7^{53}. All these topics must be regarded as living

1. Baldensperger, *Prolog des Vierten Evangeliums* (1898), has elaborated this feature of the author's purpose. There are traces of a sect which held such views in Ac. 18, 24 f.; 19, 1–7. Professor Bacon, however, in his introduction to the N. T., p. 255, is inclined to think that the sect mentioned in these passages did not consist of disciples of the Baptist "pure and simple," but was one of the many Judaistic Gnostic sects of the usual eclectic character, which, after the manner of parasitic growths, had fastened upon the movement of the Baptist, before endeavouring to absorb Christianity.

2. There are numerous instances in the Gospel where passages have evidently become displaced. It is plain that 1, 6–8 and 1, 15, interrupt the sequence of thought and would more naturally follow one another between verses 18 and 19. The passage 3, 12–14, more naturally belongs to an utterance of the Baptist, and may have stood originally between 3, 30 and 3, 31. The causes of such displacements may be due either to accidental disarrangement of leaves, or to editorial revision. (cf. Moffatt's *Introduction*, 552.)

questions of the Evangelist's own day, occasioned by the wide range of doctrinal and ethical questions that arose in the Christian communities, under the pressure of hostile thought. On many occasions, simple Christians would be called upon to give an answer to the faith that was in them. This polemical and apologetical motive makes itself felt everywhere, but in this section it is particularly apparent, and may serve as a principle of division.

"'Answers to questions' put by contemporaries "would be a more suitable term. In the Fourth "Gospel we overhear the writer, in the name of the "Church, replying to such questions as these. Is "Jesus one of the æons? Is He a vice-god or a "higher Logos? Why was Judas admitted to the "circle of the twelve? Why did not Jesus predict "His own Resurrection? Was the Crucifixion "foretold in the Old Testament? What is the "meaning of eating Christ's flesh and drinking His "blood? Why were not the Greeks evangelised "by Jesus? Why were not the Samaritans "evangelised by Him? Some of these questions "suggest cavillers, and others simply puzzled "Christians."[1]

Proceeding, therefore, with our division, we may isolate the following topics:—

(1) The Divinity of Jesus: introduced by the Bethesda story 5^{1-47} (esp. vv. $^{17-47}$). The question of the Sabbath passes into the

1. Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the N. T.*, p. 530.

larger question of the Divine creative activity of Jesus (verse 17);

(2) The Eucharist: introduced by the feeding of the 5,000, 6^{1-65}. The Eucharist reference of Chapter vi is more fully dealt with later on.[1] Here, however, we may note:—

(*a*) The use made of the two narratives (vv. $^{1-21}$), the Feeding of the Multitude, and the Walking on the Water, which follow one another, in the Synoptic order.

(*b*) The Discourse on the Bread of Life (vv. $^{22-59}$). Note the various topics of the Manna (vv. ^{31ff}), Immortality (vv. ^{39ff}), the Eucharist as the body of Christ (vv. ^{52ff}) How can Christians in the Eucharist have communion with the Risen Jesus? (vv. ^{62ff}). There is a sharp division on this point. All these represent contemporary questions, and refer to objections raised against the Christian Faith.[2]

(*c*) The Great Confession (6^{66-69}): contrasted with the Great Betrayal (vv. $^{70-71}$).

(3) The Messiahship of Jesus. 7^{1-52}.
- (1) The Messianic secret (vv. $^{1-13}$).
- (2) His want of education (vv. $^{14-24}$).
- (3) His known origin (vv. $^{25-31}$).

1. Pages 204 ff.
2. See pp. 192 ff.

(4) Is He a Messiah for the Greeks? (vv. $^{32-39}$).

(5) A vivid *résumé* of various perplexities. (vv. $^{40-52}$). (7^{53}–8^{11}, an interpolated fragment of another Gospel.)

2. The Conflict developed under the ideas of Truth and Falsehood. (8^{12}–9^{41}).

The Truth about Jesus is known :—

(1) Through His own self-consciousness, 8^{12-59}; culminating in the Pre-existence utterance (verse ^{58}). The narrative, if any, that introduced this section, for which 7^{53}–8^{11} was ultimately substituted, has disappeared.

(2) By the Evidence of Christian Experience, 9^{1-41}; introduced and illustrated by the narrative of the Man born Blind.

3. The Conflict developed as an answer to the question;—Is there salvation outside the Jewish Church? 10^{1-42}; suggested by the excommunication of the Blind Man, and answered by the allegory of the Fold and the Flock.

(1) *The Allegory* (vv. $^{1-6}$);

(2) *Christian Experience and Excommunication* (vv. $^{7-10}$).

(3) *The Death and Resurrection of the Good Shepherd the basis of Unity* (vv. $^{11-21}$);

(4) *The Good Shepherd is the Son of God* (vv. $^{22-24}$).

4. The Culmination of the Conflict—Victory; 11^{1}–12^{36}.

(1) The Main Aspect of Jesus' Death: illustrated by the raising of Lazarus. Jesus is the Lord of Life, and His death is determined by Himself (11^{1-44}).

(2) Other aspects of Jesus' death: it is neither a Fate nor a Martyrdom.

(*a*) His death as determined by the ecclesiastical authorities (11^{47-53}).

(*b*) His death understood by one at least (12^{1-8}).

(*c*) His death a Messianic victory (12^{12-19}).

(*d*) The significance of His death for the Greek world (12^{20-36}).

The section closes with an Evangelistic Summary of the significance of the Public Ministry as a whole. (12^{37-50}).

DIVISION II. CHAPTERS XIII–XX.

The Story of the Cross—A Victory and not a Defeat.

Here again the Evangelist is under the dominance of an idea, most clearly expressed in 12^{31-32}. The narrative is so arranged that the closing events are seen to be the triumphant entry of Jesus on a fuller and eternal ministry in the Holy Spirit.

(N.B.)—The arrangement of chapters and verses

in 1 and 2 which follow, are those adopted in Dr. Moffatt's Translation of the New Testament.

1. Jesus Alone with His friends.
   (1) The Betrayal Night. 13–17.
   (*a*) The Sacrament of Humility (13^{1-17}).
   (*b*) The Unmasking of the Traitor effected by Jesus Himself, even to the extent of complete control of his movements (13^{27}), 13^{18-31a}.
   (*c*) The Farewell Discourses.—The Abiding Ministry and an Abiding Union.
      (*α*) Union with Christ (15).
      (*β*) The Work of the Holy Spirit (16^{1-15}).
      (*γ*) The Second Coming, in terms of the Spirit (16^{16-33}).
      (*δ*) Some current perplexities (including Peter's denial) and their answers (13^{31b}–14^{24}).
      (*ε*) A final promise of peace and victory in presence of the Great Unknown (14^{25-31}).
   (*d*) The Prayer of the Great High Priest (17).
2. The apparent Triumph of the Powers of Evil.
   (1) The Arrest and Trial. 18^{1}–19^{16}.
      (*a*) The Arrest (18^{1-14}).
      (*b*) Before Annas (18^{19-24}).
      (c) Before Pilate (18^{28}–19^{16}).
      (*d*) The Denial of Peter; an episode ($18^{15-18, 25-27}$).
   (2) The Crucifixion and Burial. 19^{17-42}.
3. The Triumph of Jesus. The Resurrection, and Reunion with the Church, 20.

Chapter 21 is an addition to the Resurrection narratives, and an appendix to the whole Gospel.

2. The Chronological Plan.[1]

Does this hypothesis of an ideal sequence, as an attempt to explain the development of the thought within the Gospel, cover all the facts? The hypothesis is that all through there is an ideal scheme, containing a logical order. This ideal scheme may explain why the Cleansing of the Temple is set where it is, but it is apparently contradicted by the appearance of *a chronological scheme*, which also runs through the Gospel. The various incidents and sections are from time to time connected up in chronological sequence. We have, for example, the rather inconsequent words of 2^{12}. Again, the Marriage at Cana is said to have taken place on "the third day"; that is, the third day after the events recorded in connexion with the calling of the disciples, and the witness of the Baptist. These happenings appear to have occupied four days, so that one week is occupied altogether; but how could the disciples of Jesus be bidden to the wedding, as disciples, considering the length of invitation necessary?

It is, of course, always open to any one to say that an author who deals so freely with the traditional material of our Lord's ministry as to fit

1. The general question of Editorial interference with the ideal plan of the Gospel is here raised. The question will recur in the detailed treatment of Chapters xi, xii, xx of the Gospel.

it into an ideal scheme, is also capable of forcing it into a chronological scheme such as is indicated, in order to give his work more the appearance of the traditional Gospel, with its connected narrative and ordered sequence of events. Questions, however, arise in the mind, when we observe that generally in these connecting passages a strong emphasis is laid on the Galilean ministry. This rather points to the work of an editor who has felt that the original Evangelist has made too exclusive use of the tradition of a Jerusalem ministry, and that this type of Gospel does not correspond sufficiently with the traditional type, exemplified in the Synoptic Gospels.

The Gospel as it stands is set in a chronological framework, in which certain minor topographical details are also imbedded. Some of these are very vague and obscure (e.g., Ephraim, 11^{54}). The suggestion is, that this chronological framework has been superimposed on the original Gospel with its ideal division, by the hand of an editor (R), whose main purpose is to produce an uniform movement of events. It is impossible to suppose that the Gospel could have been constructed from two different points of view—an ideal and a strictly chronological—by the same hand, unless on the hypothesis that the author had no first-hand knowledge, and was quite unconscious of, or indifferent to, contradictions of fact, as compared with the Synoptic Gospels. Of course, certain

of the chronological and topographical details (e.g., 4^{6}, 11^{18}) are evidently spontaneous and natural, and stand in no contradiction to the ideal scheme. Many, however, are irreconcilable. For example, the Cleansing of the Temple cannot possibly have taken place at a very short interval after the opening of the ministry. In point of fact, the position which this incident occupies in the Gospel is a key, as has been pointed out, to the problem of dual authorship.

We may now proceed to the examination of certain passages that apparently belong to the chronological scheme :—

2^{1}. The repeated expression—τῇ ἐπαύριον—in $1^{29, 35, 43}$, need not be questioned. It indicates quite naturally three days in the early friendship of the disciples with Jesus. The expression, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ (2^{1}) strikes us as strange. What is the meaning of "on the third day"? It naturally means three days after the last of the three days mentioned previously (cf. Mt. 20^{19}, Lk. 18^{33}), and is probably intended to collect the events into one week, at the opening of the ministry. Two considerations lead to the conclusion that this chronological detail is out of place. (1) The fact that the disciples of Jesus are bidden to the wedding, and yet at the time of the invitation they could not have met Him. (2) That even three days are not sufficient save

for a very hurried journey, from the locality, rather obscurely mentioned in 1^{28}, where the call of the disciples took place.[1]

2^{12}. In verse 12 an interval in Capernaum is mentioned of " not many days." The statement is very vague, and is evidently intended to fill up the time until the Passover mentioned in verse 13 is due. The μετὰ τοῦτο (like the frequent μετὰ ταῦτα) is also extremely vague, and rather at variance with the exactness of other passages in the Gospel where time and place are mentioned. The introduction of Jesus' brothers is also strange, inasmuch as they play no part in the Gospel until 7^{3ff}.

2^{23-25}. Another passage that seems to belong to R is 2^{23-25}. It is evidently intended to introduce the story of Nicodemus, and to link it up with the preceding Passover occasion. It is apparent that the story of Nicodemus presupposes a ministry of considerable length, and a popular movement that already had time to make itself felt in ecclesiastical circles ($3^{2, 11}$). It is quite unlikely that this should be the result of one brief visit to Jerusalem. Both the Cleansing of the Temple and the visit of Nicodemus belong naturally and chronologically to a much later stage in the ministry.

3^{22-24}. These verses are editorial. The words " For John was not yet cast into prison " are

1. cf. Spitta, *Das Johannes—Evangelium*, p. 64.

an indication that R desires to correct the Synoptic story, by emphasising that the missions of John and of Jesus were exercised simultaneously, and that Jesus did not simply take up the work where John left off. Compare for other corrections of the Synoptic story 4^{54}, and the insertion of ἑαυτῷ in 19^{17}. See further grammatical notes, Appendix p. 113.

4^{1-3} The use of "The Lord" (ὁ Κύριος) as a proper name, in this passage and in 6^{23}, 11^{2}, 20^{2}, is characteristic of R. These passages on other grounds have been assigned to R. The word Κύριος is frequently used elsewhere in the Gospel as a title of courtesy addressed to Jesus, and in the vocative (Κύριε). In these cases, however, it means "Sir!"[1] J. Weiss has laid emphasis on the fact that ὁ Κύριος as a religious title of Jesus Christ is found in the New Testament, alongside a semi-mystical usage of Χριστός The latter, he says, tends somewhat to "depersonalise" the idea of the Risen Jesus, and to identify Him in Christian experience with the Spirit. "The Lord is the Spirit" (2 Co. 3^{17}).[2] The "indwelling Christ," and

1. "In the Synoptic Gospels Κύριε implies "Milord," rather than "Sir." The Fourth Gospel is different: here Κύριε is "Sir," and no more, as is clear from John xii, 21; xx, 15." F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, p. 46.

2. cf. *Urchristenthum*, pp. 330 f. Boussett, in his *Kyrios Christos*, however, denies that the title "Lord" was used by the earliest believers in Jerusalem. That usage first arose in the Gentile community of Antioch.

being "in Christ," are the watchwords of a more advanced stage of Christian experience, which reaches its earliest expression in the writings of Paul, and in which the earlier eschatological point of view gradually gave place to an inward and present relationship with the Risen Jesus. This development reaches its climax in the Johannine conception of the Christ "abiding in us," and of the Spirit as the *alter ego* of Jesus. Κύριος as applied to Jesus is probably directly borrowed from the LXX as a title of God. The mere presence of the word in itself would be rather slender ground on which to assign any particular passage in the Fourth Gospel to R; but it is remarkable that it occurs as a title only in those passages, (4^{1}, 6^{23}, 20^{2}), which may on other grounds be so assigned, and in $21^{7, 12}$. An additional motive for the avoidance of the term as a title of Christ in the rest of the Gospel, would be that the title was used of pagan deities like Mithra, and was also applied to the Emperors from Domitian onwards. The Fourth Evangelist is, as we shall see later, sensitive in many other directions to the atmosphere of the pagan cults and pagan philosophy. R, it may be conjectured, represents a somewhat earlier stage of New Testament thought than the Johannine, although somewhat later in time. The

Κύριος conception of the Risen Jesus, which involves a religious relationship, paralleled by that of master and slave, is a contradiction of the Johannine thought,—"Henceforth I call you not slaves, but friends." The correlative of "slave" is Κύριος, "Lord." R may have been a conservative of a later age, who clings to older forms of thought like Κύριος. His conservatism is further displayed when he seeks to give more space to the Galilean ministry as against the Judean, which occupied so much space in the Gospel as he found it. He seeks to build up in a chronological framework the Johannine material, to make the ideal presentation conform more closely to the traditional conception of a Gospel, after the Synoptic pattern.[1]

The involved nature of the sentence in 4^{1ff} is remarkable. The mention of the Pharisees is also

1. The use of Κύριος in $20^{18, 20, 25}$ (which belong to the original Gospel) must be regarded as intentional. This is the title under which Mary and the disciples are in the habit of speaking of Jesus, but the relationship is about to be changed. Thomas expresses the changed relationship in his confession, "My Lord and my God." He recognises that it is really Jesus and that He is really divine. The slave has become a friend, a "son." Those who know the Truth are freemen (8, 32). "The Pauline formula Κύριος Ἰησοῦς is not enough for [the Fourth Evangelist]. When Thomas says 'My Lord and my God' (ὁ Κύριος μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου), what is implied is 'It *is* really Jesus Himself, and now I recognise Him as Divine.'" (F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, p. 48). ὁ Κύριος as a title was suitable in the mouth of believers who were awaiting the Parousia; not on the lips of those for whom that Parousia had been realised in the coming of the Spirit, and the bestowal of the Spirit of sonship.

quite unexpected. Moreover, the exact significance of the parenthetic clause (verse 2) is obscure. It may have been written in order to harmonise the Fourth Gospel with the Synoptic account, where baptism is delegated to the disciples. (Mt. 28^{19}). The statements aimed at are found in 3; 23, 26. We may compare the statement in 6, 11 that Jesus distributed with His own hands the Bread, as against Mk. 6, 41; Mt. 14, 19; Lk. 9, 16.[1]

4^{43-46a} must also be attributed to R. The most remarkable utterance in 4^{43ff} is the use made of the saying of Jesus in verse 44. It implies that Judea, and not Galilee, is the πάτρις of Jesus. Attempts have been made to explain it by saying that Jesus seeks Galilee for quiet; there He will pass as a person of little note; He did not expect or desire the reception given Him by the "Galileans" (verse 45). Yet it seems obvious that, in verse 44, a contrast is intended between the coldness of Judea and not only the Samaritan reception, but also His popularity in Galilee. The mention also of Cana in Galilee is superfluous, except for the necessity of drawing attention to the similar miracle wrought there, already recounted. The "come down" of verse 47, usually cited as an instance of accurate geographical knowledge that Cana lies higher than Capernaum on the sea-level, would

1. pp. 216 f.

equally apply to any journey from an inland spot to the sea, and is the word conventionally so employed. R, in verse 54, founding on 2^{11}, emphasises that this is the second miracle wrought in Galilee, true to his plan of giving a more prominent place to the Galilean ministry.

6^{15} The ascription of this verse to R is made chiefly on the general ground that, as in other R passages, the withdrawal of Jesus is attributed to His desire to escape popularity as a political Messiah. For example, in 4^{1ff}, the escape is effected in order to avoid the impression made on the Pharisees, the leaders of the popular party, by the fact that His disciples were becoming more numerous than the Baptist's. In the thought of the Fourth Evangelist, there is no *Messiasgeheimniss* idea. Jesus is acknowledged as Messiah openly, as by the first disciples, and He makes himself known as Messiah to the Samaritan woman. The reason is that in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus is more than Messiah. He is Son of God. The imminence of the Cross and the nature of His Person constitute the real Messianic secret, which produces the sharp conflict of belief and unbelief. The Twelve are represented as staunch in spite of a clear announcement of His approaching death on the Cross, with the exception of Judas (6^{67-69}). Simon

Peter does not seek to turn Jesus from the Cross, as in the Synoptic story. Not he, but Judas is called διαβολός (6[70]).

6[22-23] is to be referred to R, largely on linguistic and grammatical grounds. There is the same involved style as in 4, 1–3. For the occurrence of Κύριος as a proper name, see under 4[1-3] (1). εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ Κύριου is a topical reference to verse 11. Also the expression ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον is not found elsewhere in the Gospel. φάγειν ἐκ (6[51]) is used, or the accusative with τρώγω (6[58]).

7[1] The usual μετὰ ταῦτα is inserted as a connecting link. The sentence probably began in the original Johannine document περιπατεῖ δέ ὁ Ιησοῦς ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ (cf. 6[2], ἀνῆλθεν δέ). The words " for the Jews sought to kill him " are an inference from their attitude in the following narrative.

7[10] This verse as it stands is an attempt to explain the apparent indecision on the part of Jesus and to preserve His consistency of action. Jesus is said to go up " not openly but in private," or " incognito." It is here suggested that the words οὐ φανερῶς ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ are an editorial addition. φανερῶς is not found elsewhere in the Johannine writings. Elsewhere in the New Testament it is found only in Acts 10, 3, where it means " distinctly," and in Mark 1, 45, of the public appearance of

Jesus. The verb is used in the sense of public manifestation, in verse 4, in the words used by His brethren. They demand a fuller acceptance of popularity, and regard His hesitation as inconsistent with complete confidence in His claims. Publicity (παῤῥησία), they say, is also necessary if the enthusiasm of His disciples is not to grow cold. This argument, however, is met by an explanation that Jesus will not take the step that may end in hatred doing its worst upon Him (verse 7) except at the divinely appointed time, and under divine guidance (verse 8)—a distinctly Johannine thought.

We shall have to recur again to the Johannine interpretation of the delays and apparent indecision of Jesus at certain moments, in our treatment of the delay in 11, 6 (pp 233 f.). As in the Lazarus story, so here, R fails to understand the reason for delay. According to J, it is due to loyalty on the part of Jesus to the will of God, as interpreted by Him. He will not meet death, at the hands of the authorities in Jerusalem, until the moment is decreed by the Father. To R the delay is due to a desire to avoid a public manifestation and reception as Messiah. He went up οὐ φανερῶς ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ. Yet the public nature of His appearance in the Temple in the middle of the Feast is unmistakable (verse 14). The delay of a day or two in Galilee, according to the Johannine conception, is

in order that Jesus might ascertain whether it is the will of the Father that He should put Himself in the position of danger involved in going up to Jerusalem, where a hostile reception awaited Him. The Divine Will is made plain, and Jesus goes. The prevailing Johannine view is of the complete publicity of the life and teaching of Jesus (cf. $7^{26, 28}$, 18^{20}). What is "hidden" is the nature and person of Jesus, from those who do not believe.

That the whole passage very early presented difficulties both to copyists and to interpreters is seen in the change of the reading οὐκ ἀναβαίνω (verse 8) into οὔπω ἀναβαίνω.[1] Zahn[2] cites Porphyry, a Neoplatonist of the third century A.D., as accusing Jesus of inconstancy and mutability ("inconstantia et mutatio"). Schopenhauer also, while engaged in proving that falsehood is not always wrong, reading οὐκ, appeals to this verse as an occasion when even Jesus Christ intentionally told an untruth.[3] It is also noticeable that the word for my "time" in the passage is καιρός, and not ὥρα (2, 4, etc.). καιρός in Greek usage is the right moment for action; in the N. T., as that moment is determined by God (cf. Mt. 8, 29; Mk. 1, 15). ὥρα is practically synonymous, although in this Gospel, the tendency is to confine it to mean the hour of Jesus' death. This word (ὥρα) is used in 2, 4, probably because the miracle is regarded as inaugurating, not necessarily in point of time, the public ministry of Jesus which reached its climax in His death.

For a treatment of the Editorial work in Chapters xi and xx, the reader is referred to pages 228 ff. and 280 ff. of this book.

[1] The more difficult reading (οὐκ) (the oldest documents differ among themselves) is to be preferred. The difficulty would have been eased had the hint in the former οὔπω (verse 6) been taken.

[2] *Introduction* III, 330.

[3] *Grundprobleme der Ethik*, 2nd Ed., p. 225.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER III

Grammatical and Linguistic Points in Chapters II–X, Peculiar to R.

2^{23-25}. There are one or two points in the language of 2^{23-25} that are remarkable :—

1. Verse 23 is the only occasion in the Gospel where belief *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* is regarded as equivalent to an inferior kind of belief based on *σημεῖα*.
   In 1^{12}, 3^{18}, 20^{31}, the phrase indicates the highest kind of faith.
2. Nowhere else in the Johannine writings, and only in Lk. 16^{11}, Ro. 3^{2}, 1 Co. 9^{17}, Gal. 2^{7}, 1 Th. 2^{4}, Tit. 1^{3} in the N.T. is *πιστεύω* used in the sense of "entrust."
3. Also the play upon words is nowhere characteristic of the Johannine style, unless 11^{12} is regarded as such. But *κεκοίμηται*, as there employed (= "sleep"), is only an instance of misunderstanding of Jesus' words (cf. 3^{4}), and quite in Johannine style.
4. *μαρτυρέω* is only once elsewhere used in the Johannine writings of witness borne to man (3 Jn. ^{12}). Elsewhere it always indicates witness to the Person of Jesus Christ.

3^{22-24}. *μετὰ ταῦτα* is one of the somewhat vague expressions of time used by R to give a chronological connexion to the Johannine material. (cf. *μετὰ τοῦτο* in 2^{12}). Also *διέτριβεν* ("spent time with") is used only once elsewhere, and in a passage ascribed on other grounds to R. (11^{54}).

4^{1-3}. As grammatical points may be noted :—

1. The phrase *μαθητὰς ποιεῖ* is not found elsewhere in the N.T.
2. *κάτοιγε* is a ***hapax legomenon*** in the N.T.

4^{45}. Certain grammatical and linguistic points are of interest.

1. *ἐδέξαντο* (received) is not used elsewhere in Johannine writings. The Johannine word is *λαμβάνω* (1^{12}). *ἐδέξαντο* is used in a similar spiritual sense in Mk. 9^{37}, Mt. 10^{40}, Lk. 9^{48}.
2. *καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ* is a unique order in N.T. Nowhere else is *καί* thus separated from *γάρ*.

4^{54}-5^{1}. 5^{1} is the only instance in the Gospel where the feast in question is not named. The mention of the miracle as the "second" is evidently based on the term *ἀρχήν* in 2^{11}, interpreted as "first"; but it is extremely probable that the translation is "this type of his signs," or "this typical sign." It is greater than works of healing, and symbolises the turning of the water of Judaism into the wine of the Gospel. cf. Abbott, J. Gr. 2386, (i).

$6^{1, 2, 6}$. 1. $6^{1, 2}$ have clearly an affinity with Mt. 15^{29-31}. It is not at all clear why they should be inserted here, unless it be to explain the presence of the crowd that has gathered mysteriously, from whence it is not said (v.^{5}).

2. Certain linguistic and grammatical points are worthy of note in these verses.

1. The addition of *τῆς Τιβεριάδος* after *Γαλιλαίας* in v.^{1} is remarkable (cf. 6^{23} 21^{1}).
2. If the reading *ἐώρων* in v.^{2} is to be adopted, we have the only instance of the imperfect of this verb in the Johannine writings. Only the future *ὄψομαι* and the perfect *ἑώρακα* are found.
3. In v.^{6} *πειράζων* is a *hapax legomenon* in the Johannine literature.

6^{15}. The following grammatical points may be noted :—

1. *ἀνεχώρησεν* is a *hapax legomenon* in the Johannine writings (cf. Mk. 3^{7}, Mt. 12^{15}).
2. *πάλιν*, if it is genuine, is difficult to account for, as the previous miracle is regarded as taking place in the "mountain" or hill-country itself, and no mention is made of Jesus' departure from it (cf. v.^{3}). The disciples also, in v.^{16}, "go down to the sea" (*κατέβησαν*).
3. *αὐτὸς μόνος* occurs in Mk 6^{47}, of which it is probably an echo.

10^{40-42}. The reasons for ascribing this passage to R are mainly grammatical. There is also the additional reason that the locality from which Jesus has set out, in obedience to the summons from Bethany, has to be defined. The journey must occupy some days if Lazarus is already four days in the tomb.

We may note (1) *τό πρῶτον* used in the sense of "formerly," and referring back to a previous incident (1^{28} or 3^{23}); cf. 19^{39}. In 12^{16} it means "at first."

2. *πάλιν*='back' in a local sense; cf. 4^{3}; 4^{46}; 6^{15}. Elsewhere it is used only in the temporal sense of "again."

3. *ἔμενεν*. Elsewhere only the Aorist is used. WH read *ἔμεινεν*.

4. *ἐκεῖ*, not only at the end of the sentence, but at the end of a section is unusual, except for special emphasis; cf. $11^{6, 31}$.

[Other passages ascribed to R are:—
$11^{2, 15, 17, 19, 31, 32}$ (partially), ^{39} (partially), $^{40, 42, 44}$ (partially), $^{45-46, 54}$, (See pp. 228 ff.).
12^{1} (partially) $^{9-11, 17, 18}$. (See pp. 229 ff.).
$20^{2-10, 27}$. (See pp. 280 ff., 312 ff.).]

CHAPTER IV

The World-Crisis in the Evangelist's Day

Paul, both religiously and intellectually, may be regarded as the Moses of Christianity in its world mission, who was permitted to survey the promised land of the Græco-Roman world created by the meeting of East and West, but was forbidden to reap the entire fruits of conquest. The vision of "the new man who is being renewed in the image "of his Creator that he might know him; where "there is no place for Greek and Jew, circumcision "and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond and "free, but Christ is all and in all"—is descried, as from a Pisgah height, whither his experience of the grace of God among the Gentiles had pointed him. The Pauline thought, however, was largely incapable of completely satisfying the Grecian mind. There still remained Jewish elements and forms of expression in his thinking—notably his visions of the end and of the return of Jesus—which were alien to the Hellenistic mind. It was left for the Fourth Evangelist, like a second Joshua, to go in and possess the land.

The Fourth Gospel is the first attempt to adapt the story and the message of the Christian faith to the new world of Hellenism. As such, it has a

peculiar fascination for the modern mind. We, too, are faced with the necessity of translating Christian doctrine into a form which shall be completely intelligible to the thought of to-day. This Gospel is a classic, for this reason among many others, that its achievement in presenting the Jesus of the Christian faith to a world whose supreme unsatisfied quest is so movingly described in the words of Seneca, " Where is he whom throughout so many " centuries we have been seeking ? "—is so fearless and consummate. The demand for a Gospel expressed in terms intelligible to contemporary thought, does not mean compromise, a mere coming to terms with modern thinking. That has never been the Christian way. Christianity triumphed over other religions in that ancient world largely because of its divine intolerance,—for the reason that it possessed, as one has put it, " the courage of its disbeliefs." Why it was intolerable to the Christian Church of the first and second centuries to hear Serapis spoken of, and to see him worshipped as " the Lord Serapis," was not merely that it denied the dim presence of the divine light that lighteneth every man in the religion of Serapis or of Isis ; not entirely that it regarded any parallels of rite and doctrine in these faiths with Christian thought or usage as diabolically prophetic parodies of its own ; but chiefly because the Lordship and Saviourhood of Jesus Christ so completely satisfied the Christian heart as to leave room for no other

Lord or Saviour. Intolerance in days of agony and persecution must not be judged, as Lecky seems to imply,[1] in the same way as the intolerance displayed by the Church in the days that followed its triumph. The real source of Christian intolerance in these opening centuries must be recognised and estimated on the principle laid down by the Fourth Evangelist himself,—"This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith"; words in which faith is not intellectual assent, but an overwhelming personal loyalty. "This is life "eternal that they might know thee the only true "God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." It is not narrow intolerance but a broad and passionate sense of truth that speaks in the First Epistle—"Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God."

The traditional Christian attitude towards new facts and fresh needs has expressed itself in two ways, both of which are exemplified in the pioneer work of the Fourth Evangelist. There is, on the one hand, the necessity for a sympathetic understanding that all who react against materialistic and deterministic conceptions of life are really, however faintly, seeking after God. That the Fourth Evangelist has allowed the all-pervading Logos conception of his time to dominate his thinking, is the first great illustration of this attitude in Christian thought. On the other hand, the

1. *History of European Thought*, I, 422 ff.

Christian outlook upon other religions involves also a clear conviction of the absolute claim of Jesus Christ to be the Saviour of the world; the faith that "in Him dwells all the fulness of the godhead "bodily," and that in a true and adequate conception of His person there will be found the satisfaction of every desire and the goal of every quest. He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. These two attitudes are of course present in Paul, but it may be said that they are seen in the Fourth Gospel, definitely and deliberately applied, and fully worked out with a reference to contemporary thought, and to the historical basis of the Christian faith.

For several centuries the old religious systems had been breaking down, and the barriers of nationality falling. With a supreme crisis in these happenings, there was ushered in the "fulness of time." Could anything be more significant or more startling than that a nation like the Jews, who had seen their beloved and inviolable Zion in flames and sacked by conquering Rome and were themselves scattered over the face of the Empire, should yet be in such a position of religious security as to be able to wrest from their conquerors a consideration and a tolerance for their monotheistic faith which the Romans accorded to no other religion, and thereby to keep alive amid the pluralistic interpretations of the universe the belief in the one God? Or that a nation like Greece, whose country had become a mere province of the Roman Empire, should have

provided the common language of the civilised world, and should have imposed its forms of thought and its culture upon its conquerors ?[1] And in the end, could anything be more revolutionary to the minds both of Jew and Greek than that a crucified Jew, despised by his own nation and either ignored or forgotten by Rome, should now be contesting world-empire with Cæsar as " Lord " and as " God," both of which were titles accorded to and claimed by the Emperor ? To the Jew it was a scandal, and to the Greek an occasion for ridicule, as Paul tells us. Paul's own reasoning is much more effective against the Jewish offence than against the Greek's incredulity. " The wisdom of this world " is hardly to be disposed of so dogmatically as Paul seeks to do ; the Fourth Evangelist seeks to provide the Christian answer both to Jew and to Greek.

It was a moment in the history of the world when a great empire was bound together in an external unity by its allegiance to one man, the reigning Emperor ; when a passionate monotheism was diffused in all places where the scattered Hebrews had come ; when Greek was the common language, and in all philosophies there was the sense of a single movement, a Logos, a vague Intelligence, gathering up the varied pulsations of human thought into one intelligent whole. But there was also a deeper and more lasting source of

1. "Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit." Horace, *Epp.* II. 1, 156.

unity. There was a secret longing everywhere in men's hearts for inward peace and security against evil, which the *Pax Romana* had given them time to heed and to develop. A great urge was making itself felt in the direction of satisfying the deepest needs of the individual soul. Matthew Arnold has interpreted that call of the Orient, that inrush of Eastern religions, chiefly the mysteries, which awakened the soul of the Roman world :—

> " Poor World," she cried, " so deep accurst,
> That runs from pole to pole
> To seek a draught to slake thy thirst—
> Go, seek it in thy soul."
>
> She heard it, the victorious West,
> In crown and sword arrayed!
> She felt the void which mined her breast,
> She shivered and obeyed.

At the beginning of the second century, the whole civilised world was one, as it had never been before in history. That sense of unity was fostered in ever-increasing strength, by the world-events in the period from the career of Alexander the Great to the founding and consolidation of the Roman Empire under the Cæsars. Military conquest had broken down the barriers that separated nations. Peoples accustomed to live, think, and pray as it were within their own walls —the walls of the Greek city-state—began to know the thoughts of those who had formerly been to them as foreigners and barbarians. The result was a growing commerce in religion and in philosophy, and a deepening sense of common spiritual need. The ostensible basis of unity in the Roman Empire

was military power, efficient government, the development of trade, and, as a political device fostering a common patriotism, the universally encouraged worship of the Emperor. The great Roman roads, from Chester in Britain to Cappadocia, linked up the provinces. Roman law dominated the civilised world. Yet this opening up of external relations between nations could not do more than induce a vague cosmopolitanism, and provide a body for the soul that was yet in the making. The body was, as yet, too big for the soul which inhabited it; the Stoic doctrine of the brotherhood of man was based on philosophy rather than on religion; the Stoic *Logos* was mainly an intellectual conception. The Empire included four great civilisations, the Oriental, the Jewish, the Hellenic, and the Roman, each of which was too distinctive and original for any one of them to absorb the others or to impose itself exclusively upon the world. They represented distinct types of mind, each of which contributed its best to the general spirit.

The unity, however, that could knit together men of every race and nation was no external unity, but one that sprang from a deepening sense of common spiritual need. There was a common longing for personal salvation, or deliverance from the impact of those blind, natural forces, in heaven or on earth—war, earthquake, famine—which from time to time engulfed the individual life. Human souls had become conscious of their loneliness and

homelessness, their subjection to disease, and all kinds of danger; political danger—the instability of governments and the uncertainties of war; moral danger—the sense of injustice and unmerited suffering, and a deepening sense of moral responsibility; spiritual danger—it may be from the heavenly powers, the "principalities and powers" of which Paul speaks, the "gods many and lords many," who permit sickness and famine and death to descend on defenceless men. Individual souls become aware that they were alone in such a vast and inscrutable universe, and craved for some kind of assurance that they did not merely inhabit a little space between the two eternities, and then go out like a candle. Life, eternal in its quality, alone could satisfy.

It was the day of the triumph of man as a moral and spiritual personality. The Greek city-state had fostered the conception that there were two kinds of men,—the intellectuals who were fit to govern, and the disfranchised mass of artisans, labourers, merchants, whose occupations were regarded as fettering the mind, and degrading the body, the latter itself an object of worship to the Greek.[1] The Greek paid dearly in bloody revolution and social unrest for his otherwise noble conception of law; for he believed that it was not intended to coerce and threaten in the first place, but only to do so when reasonable persuasion has failed. Plato says

1. Plato, Republic II, 371.

that " the laws are not tyrants and masters who " command and threaten, and after writing their " decrees on walls go their way." The Greek law, says Professor Butcher, " addresses itself to each " citizen, as his own *alter ego*, his best and highest " self."[1] The grave defect, however, in the conception soon made itself felt. In the eye of the Greek, slaves and labourers and artisans had no self of this kind to which the laws might appeal. All men were not conceived as moral and spiritual personalities. The break-up of the city-state, the coming of alien cults and foreign deities, the weakening of the external force that prevented social revolution, and the disintegration of older conceptions of religion and duty, were accompanied by a persistent assertion of human personality. The Greek was blind to the independent worth and dignity of all human beings, irrespective of education, social status, or occupation. The value of the individual life was Christianity's greatest contribution to social science. Menander, the Greek poet at the close of the 4th century, B.C.—whom Paul quotes in 1 Cor. xv, 33—voiced a new prophetic note when he said, " No good man is " alien to me ; the nature of all is one and the same." " The nature of all is one and the same "—herein lies the source of that growing sense of unity, based on individualism, and rooted in the instinctive belief that man's self lies in his moral personality. It

1. cf. Butcher, *Aspects of Greek Genius*, p. 56 ff.

found its noblest pagan expression in the Stoic conception of the Brotherhood of men as moral beings, which finds voice in Aurelius and in Epictetus; it found its divine sanction and satisfaction only in the Christian conception of the Fatherhood of God, and in the revolutionary conception of a Divine Sacrifice on the Cross for the whole world. Man rebelled against the notion that he was merely a member of a social organism, or if he belonged to a disfranchised class, a mere blind instrument, designed by Nature to further the ends of the State.[1] The Christian made an important addition to Menander's sentence. For him the sinful nature of all, redeemed by God, is "one and the same." Christianity goes much deeper than a mere appeal to democracy in the political sense. It makes, as Gwatkin has said, "an ultra-democratic appeal to the image of God "in all men."

That spirit of rebellion against the idea of man as part of a social organism found its most significant religious expression in the longing for personal immortality. Even the Jew, in the period between the Testaments, had ceased to be satisfied with the belief that his race was immortal, or that immortality was given only to certain elect and saintly souls. His glowing apocalyptic hopes for the future of his nation demanded a faith that the righteous

1. cf. Butcher, op. cit., pp. 73 ff. S. Angus, *The Mystery-Religions and Christianity*, pp. 177 ff.

who had died before the Great Day arrived, would arise to share its triumphs. However true it may be that, with the deepening and moralising of the conception of God, there are utterances in the Old Testament, as in the sixteenth Psalm, which indicate that the assurance of immortality for some pious souls was based ultimately on the goodness of God and on a personal relationship with Him, so sure that even death will not shatter it,—yet popular Jewish belief in immortality never quite emancipated itself from a concurrent belief in the immortality of the nation. In his own unspeculative fashion, the Jew had evolved the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, in which is enshrined, with a pathos not always recognised, the faith that all that is fairest and dearest in human life on earth cannot decay. The human cry thus met was in essence the same as rose elsewhere from the heart of the Gentile world, without, however, finding any answer. We may quote in illustration the verses attributed to the Emperor Hadrian :—

> Soul of mine, pretty one, flitting one,
> Guest and partner of my clay,
> Whither wilt thou hie away—
> Pallid one, rigid one, naked one—
> Never to play again, never to play ? [1]

1. Merivale's version, for the knowledge of which I am indebted to the translator of Dr. Deissmann's, *Light from the Ancient East*, 3d Ed., (E. Tr. p. 293). Note also Charon's words in Lucian's Dialogue, " I shall have a merry time of it hereafter, identifying their naked shades, as they come aboard ; no more purple robes then ; no tiaras ; no golden couches." (Tr. Warde Fowler, I, 177).

Nec ut soles dabis jocos—" never as thou art wont " wilt thou play thyself again "—the words convey the same dismal and piteous sense that death dries up all the springs of human joy, as underlies Paul's shuddering fear " lest haply he be found naked " in the day of death. Paul is never less a theologian and more a great human than when he speaks of the resurrection of the body. The fear must have invaded many other hearts than those which beat beneath the purple of Hadrian or the Apostle's cloak. Does not Paul himself speak with infinite pathos and sympathy of " those who all their lifetime " are subject to bondage through fear of death ? " Death, for Paul, meant more than the wages of sin. It meant the paralysis and negation of all that made life rich and glorious. Bodily resurrection is the Jewish, and also the Christian protest against the idea that the body is only the tomb of the soul.

Lucian, described by Froude as the " cleverest " man who was alive on this planet in the second " century,"[1] writes of a time considerably later than the date of the Fourth Gospel, but his pictures of life may be taken as typical of life in the early second century. In his *Charon*, the Stygian ferryman comes to earth to find out why it is that his passengers are so loth to leave life on earth. " Never " one of them has made the passage dry-eyed." He beholds from a lofty height whither Hermes has led him, the life of men, sailing, fighting, ploughing,

1. *Short Studies*, III, pp. 295 ff.

making money, litigating with one another in the law-courts—" usurers here, beggars there." " But " what are all these misty shapes that beset them on " every side ? " He sees men through a mist of Hopes, Fears, Follies, Pleasures, Greeds, Hates, Grudges, that arise from their own hearts. Aloft, above it all, sit the Fates, spinning each man his spindle-full, and from each spindle there hangs a man by a narrow thread. One is drawn high up into the air until the thread snaps under his weight, and he falls loudly. Another hangs so low that when he falls, " his next door neighbours will " scarcely hear him drop." Death has many messengers, from diseases to tyrants, who snap the threads, and whisk men off before they have finished scheming. " These are the blessings," says Charon, " which they all lament when they come " down to us. Never one of them has made the " passage dry-eyed." Charon is filled with a desire to preach to them, and utters himself in words like these : " Nothing of the pomp of the world will " endure ; nor can any man take anything hence " when he dies." Lucian is thus satirising the conventional consolations of philosophy, as he puts them in the mouth of Charon ; we feel also that not only is the satire sharpened, but the pathos is deepened, when he makes Hermes say, as he discourages Charon from such preaching, that it is no use ; that the ears of men are stopped as effectually as the ears of the sailors of Odysseus.

Lucian knows that to assure men that they can carry nothing hence does not suffice to make men's grasp of present things less tenacious; certainly not of the best things, less kindly.[1]

Lucian, however, must have known that the ears of all men were not incurably deaf to every philosophic appeal; for he himself wrote, and he must have had a large public. Not without disdain, and also not without real pity, he shatters the dreams of philosophy and religion which tried ineffectually to solve the mystery of life by a philosophic system of conduct or a religious formula. There were, as in our own day, masses of men and women who had no desires beyond the present, but there must also have been very many who had come to feel the inadequacy of a life limited by the bodily senses. These last were by no means confined to the upper and cultured classes. Not only of Emperors like Marcus Aurelius, and philosophers like Seneca and Epictetus was it true that,

> On that hard Pagan world disgust
> And secret loathing fell.
> Deep weariness and sated lust
> Made human life a hell.

This mood that had fallen upon men is largely inexplicable; for of these shifting phases in the human story, it is impossible to tell with precision whence they come and whither they would tend. "The Spirit bloweth where it listeth." Of the form which these new spiritual movements took, we

1. Lucian, *Charon*. Trans. Fowler, I, 167. cf. Dill, *Roman Society*, pp. 338 f.

shall presently speak. Meantime, we must be on our guard against the assumption that only in academic writings—Marcus Aurelius Seneca and others—are we in touch with the spiritual environment of the age in which and for which the Fourth Gospel was written.

The world of New Testament scholarship owes a deep debt to Professor Deissmann for his emphasis on the widespread and popular nature of this spiritual movement in the early centuries of our era. The discovery of letters, often ungrammatical and ill-spelt, written by men and women who belonged to the middle and lower classes of the time, and the inscriptions on their tombstones, have lately revealed a whole world of need and aspiration in the hearts of countless obscure souls, "a multitude," indeed, "which no man can number." Professor Deissmann has collected for us these and other classical examples of the needs of these nameless souls. Hilarion, a day-labourer, writing in the first century B.C., an affectionate and somewhat ungrammatical letter to his wife, Alis, the birth of whose child is approaching, can pen these words without any conscious brutality, "If it is a boy, let it live; if a girl, cast it out." What the prospect meant to "Alis" we may surely imagine! A message of hope lies implicit for such a world in the words, "they marvelled that he talked with a woman." A soldier writes to his father an account of his deliverance from shipwreck by prayer to the "Lord

Serapis." A lady writes a letter, marked by a well-bred restraint, to a family plunged in deep sorrow by the loss of a son and brother. She has little but tears to give, for, "after all, one can do nothing in the face of such things." No one can read unmoved the letter of the prodigal Antonis Longus, very illiterate, written home to his mother. "I walk about in rags. I am naked. Mother, do be reconciled to me!" And he further says that he mentions her in his prayers every day.[1] Such is the kind of world, a "world of souls," demanding the comprehensive "whosoever" of John iii, 16, in order to include all its infinite varieties of human sorrow and need. "The interest of the first missionary generations was directed not to ancient systems of philosophy and speculative ways of combating them, but to the salvation of souls."

The growth of spiritual individualism, the new desire of men to seek what they required in their own souls, the sense of "the void that mined their breasts," makes itself apparent in the various religious movements of the second century, of which many traces may be found. An attempt will now be made briefly to indicate their scope and direction.

1.—The Wandering Preachers.

The earliest Christian missionaries were not the only preachers who wandered in that ancient world

1. Translations of these letters will be found in A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (E. Tr., 3d Edition, pp. 297 ff) and in Professor G. Milligan's *Greek Papyri*.

from city to city, with a message for the soul. The mendicant preacher is made the target of Lucian's and other contemporary satire. Whether these indictments are well-founded or not, they at least indicate the familiarity and frequency of the figure with staff and wallet, often carrying in his heart a genuine fire of enthusiasm for souls. These men were a kind of "Salvation Army" of ancient times. Their messages were varied while they owned more or less formal allegiance to the dominating philosophic schools, Cyrenaic, Stoic, Cynic, Platonist. They must have easily obtained an audience in the streets. "Look at the number of cloaks and "sticks and wallets that are about; everywhere "philosophers, long-bearded, book in hand, maintain "your cause; the public walks are filled with their "contending hosts, and every man of them calls "Virtue his nurse."[1] Their doctrine was mostly of a practical kind. They spoke of the disillusionment which the life of the senses brings, and of the freedom which is to be gained by renunciation of the things of the body, that "tomb of the soul." The homeliness of their teaching, and the popular nature of their appeal, may be illustrated by an illuminating touch from the preaching of Apollonius of Tyana. Apollonius' eye, as he speaks in the street, rests upon a sparrow calling his brethren by his twitter to a heap of grain, and he uses it as an illustration of the duty of mutual helpfulness. No

1. Lucian, *Bis Accusatus*. Trans. Fowler, III, p. 148.

doubt there were many impostors and rogues among these travelling mendicant friars, but their numbers at least testify to the hunger in the heart of the masses for guidance in this life, and deliverance from the thraldom of destiny. The discourses of the Fourth Gospel, with their dialogue of question and answer, were, it may be reasonably conjectured, partially moulded after the fashion of the utterances of the wandering preacher.[1]

2.—Religious Magic.

In the Acts of the Apostles we read of the magician Elymas, who was a man of influence at the court of Sergius Paulus, governor of Cyprus; of Simon Magus; of the holocaust of magical books at Ephesus. These instances are open windows, through which we are enabled to observe the working of one of the most powerful influences in the religious life of the first and second centuries. Magic always hovers on the skirts of religion in times of spiritual awakening, and tends to become its substitute in needy and hungry hearts. Magic found a ready acceptance in souls who had lost their way in the maze of mingled scepticism and religious unrest. Sergius Paulus, like many another of much humbler station, craved for any light that might be given him, by conjurers and cranks who claimed to be in communication with the spiritual world.

1. The most vivid description in English of these wandering preachers is given in *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius* by S. Dill, Bk. III, Chapter II—a truly fascinating chapter.

"Bar-Jesus represented the strongest influence on "the human will that existed in the Roman world, "an influence which must destroy or be destroyed "by Christianity, if the latter tried to conquer "the empire."[1] It was in vain that clear and clever minds like Lucian's exposed the mixture of truth and falsehood; for men of Elymas' class combine the magician with the man of science in their single personalities. They claimed to cure disease by spells and incantations. The medical profession of the day must have been as deeply concerned to disentangle reality from charlatanry in the work of an Apollonius of Tyana who claimed as his patron and master, Æsculapius, the god of healing, as the scientific psychotherapist is concerned to do in face of the various healing cults to-day. It would be wrong to conclude that all the cures effected at the shrine of Æsculapius at Epidaurus were the fruit of imposture. Dill's words apply equally well to healings accomplished under religious or ecclesiastical influence to-day, as to those recorded in the second century: "A debilitated frame, "nerves shattered by prolonged suffering, an "imagination excited by sacred litany, ghostly "counsels and tales of miracle, the all-pervading "atmosphere of an immemorial faith, may easily "have engendered visions which seemed to come "from another world."[2] One cannot help

1. W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 79.
2. *Roman Society*, p. 462.

contrasting the whole atmosphere of the Bethesda story in the Gospel, with its picture of the building with the five porches erected by some unknown benefactor, and the multitude of lame and withered. The man who had repaired to such shrines for long periods without healing cannot have been a figure known only at Bethesda. How simply compassionate and comforting must the entry of Jesus into that temple of suffering have appeared to many a sick man in the Hellenistic world! Æsculapius appeared to his votaries in dreams and visions; Jesus is no dim figure appearing in a vision of the night, but a real human personality whose voice carried both pity and power.

The parallel between these early centuries and our own is striking. We have our shrines of Æsculapius, and our spiritualistic cults. Men were saying, as Anatole France makes one of his characters say of our own age, *nous sommes enfermés dans notre personne comme dans une prison perpetuelle.* In those old days also, as in ours, magic was confused with science. In particular, astrology was confused with astronomy. "Astrology," says Professor Gilbert Murray, "fell "upon the Hellenistic mind as a new disease falls "upon some remote island people. Everyone was "ready to receive the germ." Largely through Chaldean and Egyptian influences, astrology became an integral part of popular Hellenistic thought. Underlying the idea that there is a natural

connection between the movements of the heavenly bodies and the sufferings and destinies of men, there lay the semi-materialistic conception of philosophy that both human souls and heavenly bodies are fragments detached from the cosmic fire. The old gods returned from their banishment by Plato and the Stoics, and their names still persist in our own nomenclature of the stars and planets. Men's ignorance and perplexity regarding tides and earthquakes, birth and death, the whole range of human destiny, could only result in the despairing belief that they were in the grasp of inscrutable power; not merely an impersonal fate, but a whole pantheon of subordinate divinities, whose friendliness was doubtful.

There is a remarkable recrudescence in our own day of that belief in religious and semi-religious magic which characterised the Græco-Roman world. It was really based on the Stoic teaching of the *sympathy* of Nature—the idea of a certain correspondence between all the parts of Nature. A kind of "chemical" action was regarded as possible, even between what we to-day distinguish as "spirit" and "matter." There is to-day a legitimate reaction against dualism, but in the various modern religious cults known as "sciences," plentiful examples are to be found of the same kind of magic as we meet with, say, in the idea that an amulet or prayer-formula "may influence or control the "god whose affinity is with that stone or who is

"amenable to that formula."[1] Certain forms of popular sacramentalist belief have their foundation really in the idea of a certain chemical affinity. Indeed, most of the esoteric cults of our own day are but "throw-backs" in the evolution of religious thought. We can only afford to be intolerant of them when we have re-experienced and re-thought our conception of the Lordship and Saviourhood of Jesus Christ, so as to bring under His sway and power all the ever-recurrent human needs these "sciences" exemplify.

A certain pessimism, a loss of faith in ordinary human effort had overspread the pagan world of the day. This "failure of nerve," as Professor Gilbert Murray calls it, lay at the root even of the Christian faith. It led, however, in the two cases to very different results. Deep in the heart of Christianity is rooted the joyous and wondrous assurance that God, in his love for men, took the first step, reconciling in the gift of Jesus the world to Himself. He first loved us, and the Word made flesh is the abiding symbol of His care. The pagan attitude towards the divine, especially in its more popular manifestations, tends to keep the gods at a distance, and to persuade them either to be friendly towards their worshippers, or to leave them alone. Academic interpretation of the thought in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, and the attempt to derive its thought from, and to equate it with,

1. T. R. Glover, *Progress of Religion*, p. 325.

either the Wisdom literature of the Hebrew, or Philonic speculation,—however interesting, has, in my opinion, clouded the popular cast and reference of its ideas. The Prologue, like Paul's pæan of triumph in Romans viii—" Who shall separate us from the love of Christ ? "—is better sung than read. It is not without significance, in view of the popular cult of astrology, that in the Prologue it is said of Christ the Word that " all things were made " by him, and without him was not anything made " that was made." The writer projects his imagination like a shaft of light across the centuries that lay behind, and allowed it to rest on the story of the creative Word in Genesis, the Word which made sun and moon " and the stars also." At one stroke the whole, fearful fabric of astrology lies exposed and in ruins at the feet of the humblest believer in Christ who has received " power " to become a child of God. They who once wandered homeless and fearing in a trackless universe are at home in a Father's house, where the Son " had made them free indeed." [1]

The Papyri discoveries have familiarised us with examples of these magical documents, wherein the worshipper is taught how to make the god his ally, by invoking and harnessing that " chemical " affinity of which we have spoken. The teaching may be gathered from epitaphs, temple laws and sacrificial regulations, and from private letters. Among the remains of what is called the Hermetic literature,

1. John viii, 31 ff.

alongside of much that concerns the practice of the mystery-religions of which we shall speak presently, there are prayers, invocations and dedications; also horoscopes, amulets, and tablets calling down a curse on an enemy. There are also letters which indicate the bitter disillusionment that has followed on the failure of a spell or a prayer.[1]

Special interest, however, attaches in the study of the Fourth Gospel to those magical papyri where the deity speaks in the first person, employing the formula "I am." The formula "I am I, and thou art thou" has been truly called the "master-word" of these writings. It expresses the sense of safety or "salvation" in the heart of the worshipper thus united even with a capricious deity. Examples will be found in Professor Deissmann's *Light from the Ancient East*;[2]—"I am Isis the mistress of every land"; "I divided the earth from the heaven." We are reminded of the "I am" form of utterance so frequent in the Gospel, but here, again, caution is necessary. A similar form of divine speech is to be found in the Jewish prophetical writings, and there is no reason to think that these forms of speech in the Fourth Gospel were first suggested to the writer by the magical formulæ of his day. In both cases the form is a natural expression of the human heart for the divine experience. The

1. cf. G. Milligan, *Greek Papyri*, p. 113; p. 23 ("deceived by the gods and trusting in dreams").

2. pp. 133 ff. (3d Edition, E. Tr.)

significance, however, of the frequent use of the "I am" form in the Gospel is an indication that the Evangelist has in view the religious use of the same kind of formula in the popular religion. There was a cult of Isis in Ephesus. Here are words taken from a dedicatory inscription to Isis at Nysa. The dedication indicates that the worshipper identifies himself with the deity, acknowledges her power in earth and in heaven, and thereby seeks protection against the ills and misfortunes of life. He has become "deified." If we remember men's dread of the stars, it is really a cry of the human heart as well as a divine utterance that we hear in such words as these: "I divided the earth from "the heaven. I shewed the paths of the stars. "I ordered the course of the sun and moon." A majestic contrast is found in the nobler mysticism of "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life"; "I am the Good Shepherd"; "Before Abraham was, I am." The Evangelist is uttering the Christian experience of his own heart, that in living union with a Christ who lived, and died, and rose again, is the satisfaction of every desire, and freedom from every fear. He speaks in a style and tongue, somewhat strange to us, but familiar to the religious folk of his own time. The loftiest expression of the experience of God in Christ is found in "I am the Resurrection and the Life," where we must remember that only in so far as the Christian believer in the presence of death can

utter these words as a personal *Credo*, and not merely read them, is his sense of victory realised.[1] These "I am's" of the Fourth Evangelist are really extensions and applications to every deep need of human life, of the experience which Paul gives in more general terms, "not I, but Christ that liveth in me." Moreover, in these Christian utterances regarding communion with God in Christ, there is no semi-physical, semi-mystical absorption of the personality of the worshipper in the Divine being. The union is everywhere, at least in Paul, and in the Johannine Gospel, a personal and conscious relationship.

3.—The Mystery-Religions.

Space forbids any adequate treatment of the Mystery-religions.[2] They are found in Greece, as early as the seventh century B.C. They were at first of a private nature, and were conducted by guilds or brotherhoods devoted to the worship of a particular deity. Their practice introduced what was, for Greek minds, the revolutionary idea of a religion which was independent of the official

1. The "I am" form is also found in *Ecclesiasticus*, and in the *Odes of Solomon*, a Jewish Christian hymn-book.

2. The reader is referred to the book by Professor Angus, recently published—*The Mystery-Religions and Christianity*; also the important work by Professor H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*; the massive edition of *Hermetica* (*Hermes Trismegistus*) by the late Professor Walter Scott, of which only Vol. I has been published, I have been unable to consult, in time for the present purpose. The reader is also referred to R. Reitzenstein's *Die Hellenistischen Mysterien-religionen*, and to the hand-book by A. Jacoby, *Die Antiken Mysterienreligionen und das Christenthum*.

religion of the state, and for the world, the epoch-making conception of religion as primarily a matter of individual choice and experience. The worshipper belonged to the cult of free choice, and not because he was born a citizen of a particular city with a patron deity. "The hereditary principle of mem-"bership known to the state-religions of Greece and "Rome and to the church-state of Israel was super-"seded by that of personal volition which has been "the dominating principle in religious history since "the days of Alexander the Great."[1] In the second century B.C. new oriental cults had begun to invade the empire, which also took the form of mystery-religions. Those of the Great Mother, Isis, and Mithra, were the chief. These cults are distinguished from the magical religions, inasmuch as they operate not so much with spells and incantations, as with a ritual which awakened a certain sense of moral responsibility, and was kept concealed from all except the initiate. The ritual in general consisted of a ceremony of initiation, fostered a sense of communion with a particular deity, and as such guaranteed immortal life. In them not only "deification," but "regeneration," "second birth," are promised, and certain moral effects, absent from the practice of religious magic, cannot be denied.

The ceremony of initiation really demanded a certain moral fitness on the part of the candidate. Apuleius tells of a candidate who was compelled

1. Angus, op. cit., p. 65.

to remain within the temple precincts, spending the time in prayer and fasting until he was summoned by the goddess. After initiation, the communicant is said to be "born again." The divinity enters into him. Here is a prayer for use after the ceremony: "Thy divine countenance and thy most "holy presence will I hide within the shrine of my "heart; there will I guard thee and continually "keep thee before my spirit." The initiate is said to have attained to the knowledge (γνῶσις) of the god. That "knowledge" was obtained sometimes in a psychological condition produced by sensuous stimuli, sometimes by the partaking of a sacramental meal. The whole process is also described as "deification" (θεωθῆναι). The worshipper is also said to be "saved," in the sense that he is delivered from the power of fate and the threatening vicissitudes of life.[1] Above all, he is saved from death, and has within him the assurance of immortality by the divine life that dwells in him. "Thou dost undo the hopelessly ravelled threads of "fate and dost alleviate the tempests of fortune, "and restrainest the hurtful courses of the stars"—are words taken from an initiate's prayer.

This conception of salvation falls far short of the Christian idea. Apparently there was no necessary connection between these mystical experiences and a changed ethical standard, although it would be wrong to deny the ethical value of the

1. cf. Reitzenstem, *Poimandres*, p. 192, n. 2.

initiate's experience in many cases. The human figure of Mithra, represented as the champion of Light against Darkness, the deliverer of men from the dominion of demons and cosmic powers, could not fail to ennoble and strengthen the soul of the sincere worshipper; there was also a moving appeal to the human heart, depressed with a sense of sorrow or failure, in the cult of Isis; "Thou "bestowest a mother's tender affections on the "misfortunes of unhappy mortals . . . Thou dis-"pellest the storms of life and stretchest forth the "right hand of salvation." Such representations of divine victory and divine sympathy must have given rise to more than a barren emotion in the heart of the worshipper.

With all the inadequacy of the conception presented in the mysteries of what men most needed to be saved from, the remarkable and persistent desire after "salvation," the longing to be identified with the life of a God who was both "Healer" and "Saviour," is a notable feature of the mystery-religions as *preparationes evangelicae*. Christianity deepened and enriched the conception of "salvation" both in the holy and loving character of the "God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ," which it manifested, and also in the fact that Jesus was an historical figure, the Divine Being who was the first to identify Himself, in self-forgetting love, with the human life of His worshippers; sharing that life to the full—"tempted in all points like

as we are"—and dying their death. Christianity also, with its new sense of human responsibility and its new message of hope for human nature, emboldened men to take upon their own consciences the weight and guilt of moral evil, which in a kind of despair they had been attributing to the blind and hostile forces of nature. The mysteries, indeed, offered to men no cost-free religion; for initiation meant self-examination and self-sacrifice. The mystery-worshippers were the real "nonconformists"[1] of these ancient times, dissenters from a type of state religion which offered no means of personal approach to, or communion with the Divine. Yet, in their religious exercises, a man was regarded as really atoning for his own past. He carried his own burden of sorrow, indeed, all the more bravely that he was brought into a "fellowship of suffering" with some Divine Being who had suffered and conquered, had died and risen again. "Be of good cheer, ye *mystae* of the saved "deity: to you too there will be salvation from your "sorrow." The sufferings of Demeter, Isis, or Zagreus were "placarded before the eyes" of their worshippers in a kind of symbolic drama, as also their triumph over them. Yet the Mystery-religions failed to satisfy fully the hearts of men. A religion such as these, which emphasises human individuality and guarantees immortality, must also emphasise

1. And also shared some of their sufferings; cf. J. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 516.

and guarantee righteousness. This latter the Mystery-religions could not do. Neither was there any voluntary, loving accountability in the heart of the deity for sorrows and sins not his own; for the god himself, however victorious, was unable to escape the common lot. He did not suffer, as in the Christian faith, because he willed to suffer.

The growth of individuality means the development of personality, and personality means also the development of conscience. The "unexamined life," in Plato's phrase, in an age of deepening individualism, becomes an impossibility, and in these earliest years of the Christian era, men in obedience to a new sense of human personality were cultivating a habit of self-examination. They were thrown on their own resources, and sought in these disordered and uncertain times, security and peace of soul in the consolations of philosophy. Hausrath very pertinently says: "When peace with oneself "and nature becomes a philosophic problem, we "may be certain that it is lacking. It belongs "only to the times that do not talk about it."[1] Hence arose that melancholy attitude towards the possibilities of human nature, that sense of sin which distinguishes the philosophic thought of the Græco-Roman world in the first and second centuries A.D. The Mystery-religions could not satisfy. The sympathetic divine sorrow, even the will and the power to save—so men thought—were there, but

1. Hausrath, *The Times of the Apostles*, (E. Tr) I, 41.

there was no historic assurance that such a divine heart was a great reality. No human heart had ever been won by it. Such a being had never dwelt among men.[1] Isis, Demeter, Orpheus,—the only reality possessed by these was that they were personified natural forces: as actual personal beings they were never seen and known. In them, humanity had projected its own sorrows and its own longing for comfort and victory on the face of pitiless Nature—a pathetic fallacy; a hollow ministry of the poetic instinct in the attempt to satisfy the deepest of all human needs. In Euripides' play, *The Trojan Women*, Helen lays the responsibility for her sin on Aphrodite :—

> Surely it was not I,
> But Cypris there! Lay thou thy rod on her.

Hecuba tells her that Aphrodite is but another name for her own passion :—

> Ah, deck not out thine own heart's evil springs,
> By making spirits of heaven as brutal things,
> And cruel.[2]

And what men did with the "evil springs" of their hearts, they did with their hopes and sorrows. The gods who sympathise are creations as illusory as the gods who tempt.

As truly man, Jesus Christ had lived and died. "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us." He had died and was alive again, and in His Resur-

1. But cf. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (p. 469) by Jane Harrison, who claims that Orpheus was an historical figure.

2. *Trojan Women*, ll. 948, 981–2. Tr. Gilbert Murray, pp. 58 f.

rection had carried human nature as worn by Him in triumph to the throne of God. By no painful process of initiation, but by gracious invitation were men brought into living touch with God. It is no accident, but of deliberate intent, that the earliest Christian creeds, concentrated for us in the Apostles' Creed, laid such stress on the historic personality of Jesus Christ. Men were craving for a "God manifest," "some visible manifestation of "deity, such an epiphany as should right the wrongs "of the world, heal its bleeding wounds, and give "social peace and economic security."[1] The philosophical Logos and the gods of the mysteries were alike abstractions. In the end, Christianity triumphed because of its Saviour it could be said, "We beheld His glory; for He tabernacled among "us."

"Born again," "Salvation," "Eternal Life," "Power" (ἐξουσία)—these similarities in the Johannine vocabulary to the vocabulary of the mysteries, may easily mislead us as to their real significance. These terms have undoubtedly a reference in the Fourth Gospel to the language of the mysteries, but they are neither ideas borrowed in order to explain Christian thought, nor symbols used in order to adorn it. Rather did Christianity give to these ideas their final expression, and to these symbols their full reality. The centre in the new religion is not an idea but a creative Personality. "As its

1. S. Angus, *The Mystery-Religions*, p. 109

" opponents were quick to point out . . . there was " little new in Christian teaching . . . The Christians " had their answer ready. In clear speech and in " aphasia, they indicated their Founder. He was " new." [1] The Fourth Evangelist, like Paul, is too independent a thinker to allow his thought merely to be moulded by his spiritual environment. It is true that in the language of the Mystery-religions the initiate is called a " Gnostic," one who knows God ; and that the knowledge of God is the central idea in the Johannine thought : " this is life eternal to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent." It is also true that in both, the knowledge of God is not a purely intellectual knowledge, but a spiritual communion ; God and the human soul are regarded as made for one another. " He that is of the truth heareth my voice." " My sheep hear my voice." " I know mine own, and am known of mine." To know God is also to be " saved " ; thereby a new *power* is developed in the communicant which enables him to rise superior to every thraldom ; " ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." It is significant that the terms γνῶσις and πίστις are never used in the Fourth Gospel, where the corresponding verbs only are found. " To know," " to believe "—therein is indicated that the relationship between God and man in the Incarnation is no abstraction, but an active, personal relationship

1. T. R. Glover, *The Conflict of Religions*, p. 116.

which has to be continually maintained and fostered. "Henceforth I call you not servants, but friends." The spiritual and moral value of this knowledge of God depends entirely on the character of the God who is known; the moral and spiritual dynamic of salvation depends on that from which the worshipper is saved.

Who is this God, and what is he like? The Fourth Evangelist says that He is like Jesus. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." God (θεός) in Græco-Roman thought was a very fluid conception. Any god will do, for a god is always immortal. "The Greeks had no word for person-"ality. All we can say is that 'god' or the 'divine' "normally meant something alive, active, imperish-"able." Immortal and divine are synonyms; the essence of divinity and its glory is that the god is not subject to death and decay. Communion with the divine, therefore, meant in the first instance that the communicant is saved from death and from the sinister and hostile influences of the stars and elements, and the destiny they embodied. In the Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, the lineage of the idea of "knowing" God is much more naturally and convincingly to be traced to Jewish prophetic thought. "I will betroth thee unto me in faithfulness, and thou shalt know the Lord" (Hosea II, 20). Moreover, God throughout the whole New Testament is "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." "No man hath seen God

" at any time ; the only-begotten who is in the " bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." In His whole personality, Jesus is the complete Word of God. Not only in His words but in His life, God has made plain that there are now no closed secrets in divinity, no mysteries before which men must tremble in ignorance. Pagan temples always have dark places whither only the priest can go. Paul speaks of the " mystery " of the Gospel, by which he means an open secret, and the same wealth of open revelation is described in the words to Nathanael about the " opened heavens " ; also in the words, " henceforth I call you not slaves but friends ; the slave knoweth not what his Lord doeth "; and in many other passages in the Gospel. The words of Nicodemus, " How can a man be born when he is old ? " are not wilfully stupid but rather wistful. Many a seeker after God, whose habits were set and character was already formed, no longer impressionable to the sensuous appeal of the mysteries, must have so spoken. " That which is born of the flesh is flesh." It is impossible to escape the impression that the Fourth Evangelist has the *milieu* of thought created by the Mystery-religions in view ; it is equally impossible not to be convinced that these forms of expression, shared with the Mystery-religions and familiar to his readers, only served to clothe a distinctively Christian content of thought and experience.

CHAPTER V

Miracles in the Fourth Gospel

It is with difficulty that we to-day can transport ourselves back, with truly sympathetic imagination, into a world where, although the idea of a law of nature was not foreign to the minds of academic philosophers, yet the popular mind still conceived of every event, especially those events that carried with them either exceptional joy or sorrow to the individual human life, as due to the action of some living deity or other, friendly or hostile. "Belief in miracle," says Wendland, "stands simply for the position that God is alive. He must reveal himself in definite acts." Substitute "gods" for "God" in that sentence, and you have the meaning and rationale of miracle in every age of human history. Miracle is really bound up with the belief in the "livingness," the reality of deity. The good news of the Christian faith was not that some miracles happen and others do not, but that the Divine Power that governs the world and the lives of men is one, and that His character and purpose are both finally and clearly revealed in the life of the historical Person, Jesus Christ.

It would be beside the point to discuss here the general question of miracle, with which we are only

concerned so far as it touches the presentation of the miraculous in the Fourth Gospel. I think that we shall discover before we have done, that in spite of all that is usually said about the difference which characterises the miracles in this Gospel as compared with the other three, there is really a fundamental agreement in all the Gospels that the miracles of Jesus have religious value for us, not as interruptions of natural law, but only in so far as they bear witness to the personality of Jesus Christ. All the Gospel writers are agreed in this, that the miraculous in itself is no proof that the " God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," a God who is like Christ, is at work in the lives of men and in the affairs of the world.

One remark of a general kind, and applicable to our interpretation of New Testament miracles generally, may, however, be made. The whole ancient world, into the midst of which Christ came, was full of the miraculous. It was a time of vivid belief in the universal presence of divine beings, as we have already seen; and to believe in miracle was not as to-day, an act of deliberate faith, but really a matter of course. The Christian missionary then, as to-day, had no difficulty in persuading men of other faiths that miracles happen. That is the peculiar difficulty of a scientific age like our own, where we are taught to spread our minds so thinly over the whole surface of life, that all kinds of darkness easily find entrance. A scientific age

produces men whose minds have a hard place in them, men with a love of logical reasoning, which turns the edge of any appeal that seems to imply that the world is not directed by syllogisms. Such minds did not exist, at least in ordinary people, in these old days. Even the early Christian apologists did not dispute the fact that miracles were wrought by pagan deities, but looked on them as diabolical parodies of Christian miracles.

Sir Marcus Dill has vividly described the situation in the following words: "In the field of miracle "in the second century, the heathen could easily "match the Christian. With gods in every grove "and fountain, and on every mountain summit; "with gods breathing in the winds, and flashing "in the lightning, or the ray of sun and star, heaving "in the earthquake or the November storm in the "Ægean; watching over any society of men "congregated for any purpose, guarding the solitary "hunter or traveller in the Alps or the Sahara, "what is called miracle became as natural to the "heathen as the rising of the sun. In fact, if the "gods had not displayed their power in some "startling way, their worshippers would have been "shocked and forlorn. But the gods did not fail "their votaries. The Epicurean, the Cynic, or the "Aristotelian, might pour their cold scorn on "tales of wonder. An *illuminé* like Lucian, attached "to no school, and living merely in the light of "mere cultivated sense, might shake his sides

" with laughter at the tales which were vouched for " by a spiritualist philosophy. But the drift of " the time was against all such protests. The " Divine power was everywhere, and miracle was " in the air."[1]

In the last resort, the authentication of Christianity did not depend upon any claim that in Christ alone there existed, or that in the equipment of those who were His followers there existed, what the contemporary world understood to be the power of working miracles. Its authentication rested ultimately upon the power and presence of God, the Father of Jesus Christ, in the individual lives of Christians. In the Epistle to Diognetus, a Christian document, belonging to the second half of the second century, the writer, after enumerating the sufferings of Christians, and the triumphant way in which they bore them, sums up the true Christian witness in these brief words :—" These " look not like the works of a man ; they are the " power of God ; they are proofs of his presence." That, in his view, is the true miracle, and where other miracles happen, their value is determined by their revelation not in the first place of the Divine power, but of the character of the God revealed in Jesus Christ. " The Christians," he further says, " are not distinguished from the rest " of mankind either in locality or in speech or in " customs . . . neither do they use some different

1. Dill, *Roman Society*, p. 482.

" language, nor practise an extraordinary kind of " life. Not again do they possess any invention " discovered by any intelligence or study of ingenious " men, nor are they masters of any human dogma as " some are." What we are accustomed to call miracle did not impress the pagan world as an overwhelming proof of the truth of Christianity. " The timely " rainfall was attributed with equal assurance to " the incantations of an Egyptian sorcerer, to the " prayers of the believers in Jupiter, or the prayers " of the believers in Christ."[1] Tatian, for example, tells that the determining element in his conversion was that single and undivided regiment of the universe, in the hands of an infinite, gracious power, which Christianity taught. Under the influence of Christian teaching, and as related in the Christian records, miracles ceased to be portentous and dreadful, and became revelations of the nature and purpose of God, whose character was known and upon whose faithfulness men could depend. The Christian Gospel took the place of that confused and contradictory array of divine powers, which had arisen through the personification of natural forces and natural phenomena, and sometimes of mere abstractions: one living God, who was spirit and truth, banished the fears of those who had lived in such a pluralistic universe with uncertainty and dread. The ancient gods perished, not of Epicurean gibes or of hostile argument, but of neglect and

1. *ib.* p. 483.

starvation. They were no longer needed. In words remarkable both for their conciseness and restraint, and for the precision and penetration of their imaginative content, the Fourth Evangelist states the Christian position in the Prologue, "All "things were made by Him, and without Him was "not anything made that was made. In him was "life, and the life was the light of men." "We "beheld his glory, glory as of an only-begotten of "the Father, full of grace and truth." In these pregnant words, the philosophical position created by the heart-felt longings of men for Divine unity in the government of the universe and the emergence of the idea of one Divine Logos or Reason are assumed, and the claim is made that Christianity in the Person of Jesus has once for all revealed the Divine Heart and the Divine Power that made and governs all things.

The question of the authorship of the Gospel is not without interest in this connection. Delff[1] on the suggestion of the reference in xviii, 16, to "that other disciple who was 'known[2] to the High Priest,'" is responsible for the theory that the author, if it is he that is thus mentioned, was a young native of Jerusalem, of priestly family. The theory has found growing acceptance among scholars. The author was, therefore, of aristocratic origin—for the priestly families had become an aristocracy

1. *Geschichte des Rabbi Jesus von Nazareth*, p. 72.
2. γνωστός. The word implies not merely personal acquaintance (cf. Lk. 2^{44}, 23^{49}) but kinship.

in close touch with the Roman Government—and was resident in Jerusalem during the time of Our Lord's ministry there. There are other indications in the work of later Christian writers of the second century of such a figure, whose name was John.[1] Professor Burkitt has, so far as I am aware, been the first to draw from this interesting fact certain inferences that are full of significance for the interpretation of the idea of the miraculous in the Gospel.[2] If the writer was of priestly family, he must have been originally a Sadducee, for at that time the succession to the priestly office was in the hands of the Sadducaic party.

It is noteworthy that the name "Sadducee" is not once mentioned in the Fourth Gospel, perhaps because the writer regarded it as a nickname.[3] There are also certain characteristic features in the thought of the Gospel which are explained, if the writer had originally belonged to this ecclesiastical party. In Acts xxiii, 8, Luke says that "the Sadducees say there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit," by which is meant that they rejected the Pharisaic doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and that they refused to accept the elaborate doctrines of a hierarchy of angels, and of innumerable demonic influences, which the later Judaism, largely under the influence of Persian

1. Eusebius, V, c. 24, "John who leaned upon the bosom of the Lord, and became a priest wearing the sacerdotal plate."
2. cf. A. E. Garvie, *The Beloved Disciple*, pp. 180 foll.
3. F. C. Burkitt, *Gospel History*, p. 248.

and Chaldean modes of thought, had elaborated. The existence of this demon-world is very apparent in the popular thinking that appears in the Synoptic Gospels. Their existence is not denied, but their power is neutralised and overcome by Jesus. On the other hand we may recall the general remark of the Evangelist, that "spirit was not yet" (John vii, 39) during the earthly ministry; it is conferred on the disciples for the first time when Jesus "breathed on them" after the Resurrection (xx, 22). At the Baptism the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus "as a dove" is a vision of the Baptist alone. "Angels" do not appear in the Gospel until after the Resurrection, when two are seen by Mary at the tomb. "It was not until "the resurrection of the incarnate Word of God "that angels were seen by mortal eye. Therefore, "when the voice came from heaven (xii, 28), "it is the ignorant multitude, not the Evangelist "in his own person, who supposed that an angel "had spoken to Jesus."[1] The erstwhile Sadducee has learned to look on the unseen world only through the eyes of Jesus; in His person and ministry the angels of God are seen ascending and descending. The demon-world is strangely absent in the Fourth Gospel. The phrase "thou hast a devil" occurs three times in the mouths of opponents; "Satan" is the protagonist of evil, and is spoken of as the "Prince of this world." Herein is seen the tendency

1. F. C. Burkitt, *Gospel History*, p. 249.

which, no doubt, the Sadducees represented, to return to the earlier Jewish point of view that there is a single power of evil, and to reject the later Jewish speculations on the mysteries of the Unseen. We may also detect the same trend of thought in the references to belief in the Resurrection in this Gospel. Martha represents the conventional, Jewish point of view, when she says " I know that he will " rise again in the resurrection at the last day." To the Evangelist that doctrine is only credible " in Christ Jesus "—" I am the resurrection and the life " ; we note also the words that are sounded three times in Chapter vi as a Christian refrain, " I will raise him up in the last day." The reader is referred to the remarks that are made later on regarding this Evangelist's conception of the Resurrection of Our Lord.[1] For him the Resurrection is not a deduction from the idea of a providential order ; he does not emphasise the resurrection of the body, if it enters into his scheme of thought at all ; the body of the Risen Lord before the Ascension is one that may not be touched, or rather " clung to," as an object of faith ; in other words the resurrection life is a part of that new order of things which is bound up with the existence of the glorified Christ, and rests on the truth of His " word." " If it were not so, I would have told you."[2]

1. pp. 280 ff.
2. cf. Our Lord's answer to the Sadducaic quibbles about the Resurrection, " God is not a God of the dead, but of the living," which raises in an acute form the problem of bodily resurrection.

We may also, it seems to me, detect the same Sadducaic temper of mind in one or two of those chance remarks about the popular love of the miraculous, the demand for a "sign." Nicodemus approaches Jesus by way of his miracles—"no man "can work the miracles that thou doest, except "God be with him"—only to be met with the sharply expressed statement that human eyes are blind to the working of God without a second birth. A similar thought is somewhat abruptly intruded in the story of the nobleman at Capernaum, "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe." The Evangelist evidently regards the miracle of the loaves and fishes as on a different plane from the "signs" beloved of the populace—a difference which is implicitly and tacitly suggested in what appears to us the strange demand for a "sign" immediately after such a miracle as was already part of their experience (vi, 30). To the Evangelist, there are signs and signs. The same word (*σημεῖον*) is used of both, although the popular content of the term is indicated in the words "signs and wonders" (*σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*) in iv, 48.[1] In vi, 26, Jesus is represented as

1. The word (*τέρατα*) is never used alone in the N. T. of Jesus' miracles or of those wrought by His disciples. These are regarded as different from the prodigies and portents of the pagan world. The word is always used in this connexion in conjunction with *σημεῖα*, "signs." The wonder (*τέρας*) is anything marvellous or extraordinary in itself, while the sign (*σημεῖον*) is not an objectless phenomenon, but is a token of the agency that is at work, and of the purpose it is meant to fulfil. (cf. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p, 406).

actually blaming the crowd because their flocking to Him was not "because they saw signs," but because their bodily hunger was satisfied. Such a subtle distinction is not only very suggestive of the Evangelist's conception of miracle, but contains also a very important religious truth. Miracles are not meant as a kind of external compulsion, browbeating the judgment or terrorising it into belief in God; they are of value only as indicating the nature of the God whom we worship, who is perfectly revealed in the person of Jesus Christ.

It seems certain that "works" (ἔργα) in the Fourth Gospel include more than miracles. The same word is used of the ordinary actions or "works" of men, their whole behaviour good or bad (iii, 19). There is no suggestion in the Gospel —at least in those passages that are unaffected by editorial revision and addition—that the miracles have a value as evidences of Jesus' nature and origin more convincing than the other events of His life, or than His words. The interview with Nicodemus, the conversation with the Woman at the Well, the dialectic overthrow of opponents in Chapter viii, are all equally occasions on which the supremacy of His person is demonstrated. The idea that the miracles are not to be isolated from Jesus' other activities, especially His preaching, is found in the Synoptic Gospels also. In Matthew xi, 2–5, in answer to the Baptist's message, attention is directed both to the healings and to the preaching

of the Gospel as demonstration that He is the Messiah. The miracles are a part of His mission, not sole proof of it. Even the story of the healing of the paralytic (Mark ii, 10 f), is no exception. A superficial reading of the words, "but that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins," would indicate that the physical miracle is regarded as a proof of the inward change that has taken place in the man's heart. The physical miracle had not impressed the scribes at all unduly; they were disturbed by the words that were the prelude to it, "Thy sins be forgiven thee." Our Lord says to them "but that ye may know,"—may behold an actual example of all that is involved in the "forgiveness of sins." The psychology of healing to-day teaches that certain forms of physical disability are due to moral and spiritual causes, and it is no doubt true to say that the cure was in all essentials accomplished in this case, once the man believed that his sins were forgiven. It is also quite in accordance with psychological truth to assert that "the gradual cure of the physical "symptoms was accelerated by further therapeutic "action on the part of the healer, viz., the definite "order to get up and walk."[1] He desires to shew these doubters the whole significance of the words at which they cavilled. It is possible thus to view this particular miracle, without in the least suggesting that Jesus accepted the current view that

1. E. R. Micklem, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 88.

sin and disease were always inseparably connected.

I have cited this particular Synoptic miracle in order to shew that the difference of conception between the Synoptic and the Johannine miracles may be greatly exaggerated. In the miracle just referred to the result is to demonstrate the Divine personality of Jesus. The words "Thy sins are forgiven thee" are interpreted by His critics as involving a Divine claim; otherwise it would have been futile to accuse him of blasphemy. If that be so, is it valid to say, as has been so often said, that Johannine miracles in their conception are far removed from the Synoptic point of view, and that in the Fourth Gospel the miracles are employed merely in order to prove an evidential point? In the Fourth Gospel, the fact that Jesus works even such a stupendous miracle as the raising of Lazarus does not establish His claim to be the Son of God. Rather this particular miracle displays His personality as "the Resurrection and the Life." The Fourth Evangelist sees in the miracles manifestations of the Divine personality of Jesus; in so doing, is he not only completing on a grander scale what is begun in the Synoptics? When Mark says that "moved with compassion, he stretched forth his hand and touched him," the compassion shewn in the "touch" without any thought of ceremonial defilement, is a greater miracle than the cure. We are made aware of the commanding, penetrating, sympathetic personality of Jesus,

radiating hope and cheer to men, one who demands faith in Himself before healing is possible. It is incorrect to say that in the Johannine Gospel it is the miracle that induces the faith, that the miracle is followed by the faith of the patient. It is not only incorrect, but misleading; for in the Synoptic story also, there is both a faith that precedes the miracle,[1] and there is a greater faith that follows it. The whole ministry of Jesus, including His miracles, the contact of the disciples with His whole personality, led them into the faith that He was the Son of God. The Great Confession of Peter, that crisis in the story of the disciple band, when they discovered who their Master was,—as He had been waiting and longing for their discovery, through His words and friendship, of a truth which could not be told in words—is itself partially the direct result of Our Lord's miracles, and is the climax of their faith. I confess that I cannot see where the Johannine miracles differ from the Synoptics, save in the grandeur and the power of the Lord whom they are intended to reveal. The contrast between the Synoptic miracles and the Johannine has nowhere been more impressively stated than by R. H. Hutton :—

"The miraculous power which in St. Matthew,

1. Even in the Lazarus' story, the miracle is not wrought until Martha has made her confession of faith, and has made it with emphasis, "Lord, I do believe (πεπίστευκα) that thou art the Christ." The verb is in the perfect. So at Cana of Galilee, Mary's faith, in the words "Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it," is uttered *previous* to the working of the miracle.

" St. Mark and St. Luke is mainly the organ of a " Divine compassion for human misery and pain, is " in this gospel—primarily at least—the revealing " medium of a mighty spiritual presence, and intended " more as a solemn parting in the clouds of Providence " to enable man to gaze up into the light of Divine " Mystery than as a grateful temporary shower of " blessing to a parched and blighted earth." [1]

In other words, the Fourth Evangelist is concerned to present the miracles of Jesus as revealing in all its fulness the permanent and abiding Miracle of the Word made flesh, dwelling among men and revealing the glory of God. His account of the miracles is partially the fulfilment of the promise to Nathanael, " Henceforth ye shall see the heavens opened, and " the angels of God ascending and descending upon " the Son of Man."

Even in the Synoptic miracles, something much greater than the compassionate sympathy of Jesus with human suffering is hinted at. While it is true to say that in the Johannine miracles, the motive of compassion recedes into the background, as for example when it is said " This man was born blind, " that the works of God might be made manifest," or that Lazarus is sick unto death " that the Son of Man might be glorified "—the revelation of the personality of Jesus as Lord of the demon world in Mark is as lofty a religious conception as anything that we find in the Johannine Gospel.

1. *Theological Essays*, p. 178.

The patients of the Healer are enjoined to be silent, in order that the true spiritual nature of the Healer and the significance of His work, may not be clouded. Moreover, when Jesus is accused of casting out devils by the power of Beelzebub—in other words, when His gracious and sinless personality is confounded with the incarnation of evil and good is called bad—He uses words of unparalleled severity to His enemies, and says that they are guilty of the unpardonable sin. They have spoken not against the Son of Man in the blindness of their ignorance, but they have defiled and debased the power of God working through the Son of Man. The divine mercy and love may be spurned, but it is a heinous crime to trample them in the mire. Surely, here also there is manifested in the miracles of Jesus a conception of His personality, which, only in expression, falls short of the idea of the Incarnate Logos, who manifests His "glory" through the miracles of the Fourth Gospel.[1]

If it be conceded that the passages in the Lazarus miracle, which indicate that it is a spectacular sign worked before a crowd, in order to produce wonderment and faith, are to be regarded as editorial,[2] that miracle falls into line with the

1. It may also be pointed out that in the Fourth Gospel, there is found here and there the same tendency to give a lower place to the faith which is founded on miracles as in the Synoptic Gospels. cf. John x, 37; xiv, 10 ff.
2. pp. 229 ff.

other Johannine miracles, which are conceived as transparent media through which we catch sight of the Lord of Life and Light, whose power is stronger than darkness and death. In the miracle of the Feeding of the Five Thousand there is a strange lack of emphasis on the extraordinary nature of the incident. Immediately after its occurrence, the same people who had been fed are represented as clamouring for a "sign"; just as in the Synoptic story, after the same miracle, the disciples are filled with anxiety because they are likely to fall short of food on their voyage.[1] Here is clear indication that the Evangelist does not regard what has happened as intended to be a striking and portentous occurrence, likely to impress the wonder-loving mind. Clearly these writers do not regard such miracles from the same standpoint as we are tempted to do,—merely as external and exceptional aids to faith. Moreover, the thirty-eight years' duration of the illness of the invalid at Bethesda is probably not intended to enhance the greatness of the physical miracle (as is often said), but to demonstrate by the question, "Wilt thou be made whole?" the Divine insight of Jesus, who knows the wealth of expectant trust and latent human possibility that lie buried deep in the soul of the worst case that lay under the porches of Bethesda.

There are also indications that in the Fourth

1. Mk. viii, 14 ff.

Gospel the personality of Jesus is not always so exalted, aloof, and dispassionate, as is sometimes asserted. Tense emotion is both implied and expressed in the story of Lazarus, and in the meeting with Mary in the garden. If the Figure that is displayed before our eyes often seems lacking in those human traits that lay hold of men's hearts in the Synoptic Gospels—as, for example, the lost sheep on the shoulder of the Shepherd, and the neighbours rejoicing; if Our Lord appears more often as a Heavenly Being "tabernacling" on earth, who has ascended on high, and led captivity captive, and already is seated at the right hand of God, it is remarkable to note that the Evangelist rejects the common Synoptic term for miracle (δύναμις). He never speaks of them as "mighty works." "He avoids the word δύναμις, not only when "meaning a mighty work, but also in the sense of "'power.' He abstains also from the word 'power-"ful,' and from the synonymous words 'strength' "and 'strong.' He seems to desire to shew that "heavenly power is far above 'might,' and deserves "a higher name. Accordingly, he calls it by the "term 'authority'" (ἐξουσία).[1] Love is on the throne of the universe, and the same love is manifested in the "signs" The authority is exerted by One who has a kingdom, whose glory is not displayed in that material wealth and external force which are the characteristics of kingdoms

1. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*, 1669, cf. 1562–94.

that are "of this world." Moreover, it is an authority which is used to lift men up to a level with itself, enabling them to become "children of God"; to emancipate the slaves of sin, and to transform them into friends of God.

We must also take into account another consideration, which renders any real comparison between the Johannine and Synoptic miracles somewhat illusory and misleading. As we have already seen, when the question of the historicity of the Gospel came up for consideration, the attitude of this Evangelist towards the details of the ministry of Jesus is different from that which underlies the Synoptic narratives. Here again, we are faced with the problem of the psychological attitude of the Evangelist towards the traditional material out of which the Gospel is composed. When, as he tells us, he made the selection which he does out of the "many other signs which Jesus did," he made that selection on the ground that the particular miracles selected are peculiarly suited to the purpose which he has before him. These selected miracles were regarded as inherently suitable for the display of the personality of Jesus Christ, as He had come to be regarded in the experience of the Christian Church and in the Evangelist's own experience, as Lord of Life and Death, as the Light of the World, as the Good Shepherd, as the Bread of Life,—indeed as gathering up in His own person all that is involved in a perfect expression of the Word of

God. The Evangelist intends that the miracles shall be scenes on earth in which the "Truth" is displayed, the ultimate Reality revealed. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." In order to effect this purpose, the Evangelist is not so fettered to a literalistic interpretation of the traditional narratives or to their details, as to be precluded from exercising his dramatic power of free creation upon the material at his disposal. In spite of the undoubted similarity in *genre* and expression of thought which exists between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, owing to the presence in both of creative elements of experience, the conscious adaptation of the material in order to serve a well-defined and clearly expressed purpose of the writer is much more marked in the latter.

The dramatic significance of the miracles in the Fourth Gospel renders them, in the last resort, as unsuitable for comparison with the accounts in the Synoptics, as would be a mere comparison of one of Shakespeare's plays with the actual story, found in any of the sources he employed. We are really comparing things that are essentially different. We must often have felt, as we read the stories in this Gospel, that the historical interest tends to disappear from our minds altogether; that the figures either appear to be lay-figures on which the Evangelist arranges the drapery of his thought, or are lost in the thought itself. We feel this in the ordinary narrative. The figure of Nicodemus is

the most elusive in the whole Gospel, and the subsequent mentions of him tell us little. Even his name, "Conqueror of the People," seems to be used allusively, and to be played upon in the reference to him as "the Teacher in Israel." If the writer's historical interest in the narrative tends to give place to one that is devotional and doctrinal, we are also made to feel that his interest in the miracle stories, as historical happenings, similarly disappears when he begins to write.[1] He is himself lost in contemplation of the "glory" of Christ. In the Lazarus story, he sometimes writes rather as one who is recording a vision, than as one who is recounting an historical happening. The emergence of the figure from the tomb, bound hand and foot with the cerements of death, of whom it is said, "Loose him and let him go," is a phantasmal picture which belongs to the region of vision. It is the vision of the dramatic poet. Canon Streeter seems to me to go beyond the facts in suggesting that a story like that of the Raising of Lazarus belongs to the category of the mystic's vision, and that the happenings therein recorded were actual auditions or visions of the writer, which had their origin in mystic trance. The writer's insistence on the factual nature of the Incarnate Word throughout the Gospel is too strong to justify such a hypothesis.[2] There is more truth

1. cf. Wendland, *Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur*, 3rd Edition, p. 307.
2. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 390.

in the statement that to this Evangelist the miracles of Jesus are not really extraordinary acts, but naturally followed from the personality of Jesus. They are the manifestations of the Divine Power entrusted to Him, self-manifestations of God Himself. The miracles of the Fourth Gospel are like the deeds of prowess described as ἀρεταῖι, which were ascribed to kings and leaders of men, and are mentioned in contemporary inscriptions, where not only ἀρετή, but δόξα also is used in this sense. At Cana also, the disciples "beheld his glory." Lazarus is raised that the Divine Glory may be displayed on earth in a victory over the grave.[1]

1. cf. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp, 95 ff: *Light from the Ancient East*, 3rd Edition, pp. 322, 2; 386, 6.

CHAPTER VI

The Discourses of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel

The style of the discourses in this Gospel is the same as the style in which the whole Gospel is written. The contrast both in style and content is very marked as compared with the Synoptic Gospels, and goes much deeper than is generally supposed. It is more than a linguistic contrast, or a mere contrast in style. As in the narrative portions of the Gospel, so in the discourses there is much more than an added element of interpretation and reflection. This feature is present in a marked degree, and is akin, as has been pointed out, to what happens in the noblest preaching. It is the result that follows a fact or saying that has been brooded upon, and developed in oral or written address. It is quite true that, as will presently be pointed out, there is a perspicuous historical element in the discourses of this Gospel, and the parent ideas if not the words are those of Jesus. As Paul said, so might this Evangelist say, "I have the mind of Christ." The Evangelist has taken no unwarrantable liberties with the consciousness of Our Lord. At the same time, the dialogues, as in the Nicodemus story, often become monologues, and the problem

is not resolved by suggesting that at some point, the words of Jesus insensibly pass into a discourse of the Evangelist. In the Nicodemus chapter, Jesus speaks to the end (i.e., as far as verse 21), and speaks in a style which presents a startling contrast to His style in the Synoptics. Again, there are dialogues such as the dialogue with the Samaritan Woman, filled with vivid repartee and allusive detail, which passes into the great missionary vision of fields white unto harvest, as the villagers stream out to see the man who has so disclosed the secrets of the woman's heart. Another feature, which presents more difficulty, is the occurrence of disputations with opponents in the open street, or in the Synagogue. So fierce is the disputation and so subtle are the points scored—occasionally by a Rabbinical use of Scripture—against opponents, that it is well-nigh impossible to conceive the historical Jesus as so speaking. It is true that the Johannine discourses contain many sayings, either found in the Synoptics or akin to these in thought: yet in the controversial utterances generally, there is often a reliance on pure dialectic, which is foreign to the direct prophetic character of the Synoptic utterances.

If, by this attitude towards the Johannine discourses, we seem to lose in point of secure, historical basis, to suffer some irreparable loss in religious and devotional value, we must remember that we have also an incalculable, religious gain. The problem has an affinity with that created by

the prophetic discourses in the Old Testament. "Thus saith the Lord" is the prophetic formula, and in the Old Testament the words of the prophet are also the words of the Lord. "Thus saith the Lord" really means "This is the mind and will of God."[1] In this Gospel the formula is "Jesus said." It is the same as though it were "Thus saith the Lord," or "Thus saith the Spirit," affording a very significant indication of the place given to Jesus in the earliest Christian consciousness. What we appear to lose in historical accuracy, we regain and more in our sense of the reality and truth of the earliest belief in the Person of Jesus. Moreover, it has to be remembered that the Evangelist is in line with the reaction that had already set in against the purely legalistic use of the sayings of the Lord.[2] This growing legalism, the tendency to rely upon the written word for ethical sanctions is, as we have already seen, illustrated in the *Didache*.[3] There was required a reinterpretation of His words in general, such a disclosure of their timeless meaning as we find in the pages of the Fourth Evangelist.[4]

In Ignatius also, we find not merely a reaction against the docetic interpretation of the principal

1. The Hebrew *amar* can mean both "say" and "think." cf. Strachan, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 3*f*.
2. pp. 33 f.
3. pp. 33 f.
4. There is no such literary form as *oratio obliqua* in Hebrew or in Aramaic. The only form congenial to the mind of the Fourth Evangelist in recording and interpreting Jesus' words was direct speech.

events in the life of the Lord, but also a similar reaction against any interpretation of His words, which would give them merely legal force. The fact that Ignatius lays such stress on the religious value of obedience to the bishops, even though he inaugurates another tendency towards a religion of authority quite as harmful, at the same time shews that he regarded the words of Jesus as requiring the co-operation of human interpretation. His own passionate insistence on the sin of schism, and on obedience to "the bishop and the presbytery "and deacons," he asserts, is the voice of the Spirit. "He in whom I am bound is my witness that I "learned it not from flesh of man; it was the "preaching of the Spirit who spake on this wise." Afterwards, when he goes on to speak against those who claimed that his teaching was not in accordance with the "charters," viz., the Old Testament—"If "I find it not in the charters," they say, "I believe "it not in the Gospel,"—he uses these significant words: "As for me, my charter is Jesus Christ, "the inviolable charter is His Cross, and His Death "and His Resurrection and faith through Him."[1] The old man knows the truth contained in His own words elsewhere. In a remarkable passage he says of Jesus Christ: "Now there is one teacher, "who spake and it came to pass: yea, and even "the things which He hath done in silence are "worthy of the Father. He that truly possesseth

1. *Philadelphians*, 7, 8. (Lightfoot's translation).

" the word of Jesus is able also to hearken unto " His silence." [1] The Fourth Evangelist has heard these silences. Silence is the method of revelation all through.—" There is no speech nor language; their voice is not heard." As the Old Testament prophet interprets in words the silences of God in His dealings with men, so does John interpret in his Gospel the things which Jesus " hath done in silence " by the ministry of the Spirit of Truth, things " worthy of the Father." He utters the silences of Jesus as they ever fell on his listening ear, although these actual words may never, as Drummond beautifully puts it, " have ruffled the air of Palestine." [2]

There is a clearly-defined, historical element in the discourses of Jesus in this Gospel. If the words are the words of the Evangelist, the ideas are Christ's. Professor Burkitt has drawn attention to the historicity of the idea contained in such a saying as " My Father worketh hitherto and I work." [3] It is, indeed, difficult to see why such a saying should not represent *ipsissima verba*. The saying is the basis of the whole discourse that follows, and its style has affinity with the lofty and authoritative manner of the words, " The Son of Man " is Lord also of the Sabbath." Behind the words that we have just quoted from the Fourth Gospel,

1. Ephesians, 15.
2. Drummond, *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 41.
3. v, 17.

there lies the same conception of Christ's relationship to the Father as all-sufficing, which we find in the Synoptic words, "No man knoweth the Father but the Son." Jesus knew the Father directly, and not through tradition as the scribes did, and the knowledge guides not only His utterance but His action. He had been arraigned on a question of right and wrong, of what the opponents considered a question of eternal moral law. Jesus replies "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work"; as though He would say, "the laws of Nature and of Right and Wrong do not observe the Sabbath." In the Synoptic record, God makes His sun to shine on the evil and the good; the Fourth Evangelist's version of Jesus' words in this discourse reiterates the same truth in an even more direct way, implying that "God makes His sun to shine on the Sabbath as on the week-day." If there is an added element of majesty in the words of Jesus as given in the Fourth Gospel, it is in line with the conception of the creative activity of the Logos as described in the Prologue. "All things were made by him." The Evangelist has here before him an authentic tradition, and this discourse is not wholly the product of his own creative mind and dramatic consciousness. "Is it not more natural to "suppose that such a way of thinking about the "Sabbath came to him from without rather than "from within, by memory or tradition rather than "by imagination? The wording is the wording

" of the Evangelist, he has made it all his own " before he gives it back to the world, but the " leading thought is the subject and source of his " theology, not a product of it."[1]

The question of the historicity of the discourses is raised in an acute form by the discourse contained in Chapter viii. It is all the more important to consider this particular discourse, because it contains utterances which make it extremely difficult to believe that Jesus, in actual fact, could ever have argued as He does in this particular instance. We sympathise with the mystification which takes possession of the minds of His opponents, and we hardly expect mystification to be met by such an argument as appears in the assertion about the " twofold witness " to the Person of Jesus (verses 17–19). The one witness apparently is Jesus Himself, and the other is God the Father. The opponents reply, keeping the same dialectic level, " Where is thy Father ? " Similarly in verse 25, Jesus' argument is met by the question " Who art thou ? " The discourse from verse 21 onwards is clearly based upon the necessities of anti-Judaic apologetic in the first or second century A.D. It is impossible to imagine that Jesus of Nazareth should thus speak to men from whom had been as yet withheld the crowning argument of the Resurrection, and of the type of Christian life which the Resurrection had produced in the lives of

1. Burkitt, *Gospel History*, p. 241.

His disciples. It is further to be noted that the argument is conducted on a theological basis, which is in contrast to the ethical appeal of an utterance like, "The Sabbath, was not made for man, but man for the Sabbath," or the quotation from Hosea, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice."

At the same time, even in this the most difficult of the discourses of Jesus in the Gospel, that the historical basis and groundwork of the thought is in correspondence with the consciousness and utterance of Jesus as He is presented in the Synoptic tradition, is quite clear. We may confine ourselves in the discussion of this point to the verses 39–48. This part of the discourse is addressed to "those Jews that had just believed on Him." The believers so described are difficult to define, but the course of the argument makes it fairly plain that their outlook was akin to the outlook of those who were Paul's constant enemies, the Judaising Christians. The question as to those to whom the argument is addressed is not, however, important for our purpose. The point at issue is, how men are to be free from the bondage of sin. The words of verses 35, 36 are reminiscent of the Pauline teaching, and there is underlying the whole passage that eternally recurrent controversy regarding the religious value of the Jewish law, which not only appears in the Pauline epistles, but must have constantly demanded the attention of the Christian preachers as they met the influence of the Jewish synagogue.

The controversy is brought to a climax in the claim that "Abraham rejoiced to see my day," and "Before Abraham was, I am." Even this utterance of a consciousness of pre-existence is not inconsistent with the consciousness of Jesus expressed in the Synoptic Gospels. There we have the frequent reference to Himself as the Son of Man, and the title Son of Man, derived as it is from Daniel vii, does not exclude, but rather suggests, the idea of pre-existence.

It would not be difficult to cite several other instances in the Gospel where the central ideas of the discourses are derived from sayings of Jesus, preserved in the traditions of the Church and recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. Moreover, it must be remembered that we possess only fragments of Jesus' actual teaching and utterance. "Except a man be born again"—the form of the words is reminiscent of the language of the Greek mysteries, but the words themselves are really another expression of the idea contained in "Except ye become as little children," and thus made more intelligible to Greek readers. It is not difficult to trace the lineage of the allegory of the Good Shepherd or of the Vine in the thought of the Synoptists. "Except a grain of corn fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone" is a precious saying of Our Lord preserved by this Evangelist, and the field of waving grain which is the fruit of the seed's decay conveys that beauty and pathos which is Christ-like,

and clothes the bareness of the Synoptic epigram which it precedes, " He that loveth his life loseth it."[1] What else is the idea expressed in " Neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father," than an utterance of that universalism transcending all national limitations and social caste, which breathes in, " They shall come from the East " and from the West, and shall sit down with " Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom " of Heaven. And the sons of the kingdom shall " be cast out into the outer darkness.[2] " Again, the claim to universal dominion so magnificently uttered in the words " Now is the judgment of the " world ; now is the prince of this world cast out. " And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto " myself "—what is this but a version, enshrined in language more intelligible to a Græco-Roman world, of the lofty words spoken before Caiaphas, " I " am : and ye shall see the Son of Man seated at the " right hand of power, and coming on the clouds " of heaven " ?[3]

Perhaps the most illustrative example of the way in which this Evangelist weaves his thought around actual sayings of Jesus is to be found in the mention of the saying about the " little while " that must elapse ere the disciples saw Jesus again, in xvi, 16 ff. It is impossible to come to any other conclusion than that here the Evangelist is taken

1. xii, 25 ; cf. iv, 35-38
2. Matt. viii, 11, 12.
3. Mk. xiv, 62.

possession of by an utterance of Jesus Himself in the days of His flesh, and is seeking to interpret it for his contemporaries. The single word μικρόν "a little while," occurs several times in the passage in the words "a little while and ye shall no longer "behold[1] me, and again a little while and ye shall "see[2] me." The disciples are confused, and in their perplexity there is mirrored a perplexity in the Church, contemporary with the writing of the Gospel. The words were, no doubt, interpreted as referring to the imminent Parousia. The Evangelist applies them to the short interval between the Death of Christ and His reappearance after the Resurrection.[3] At all events, the recurrence of the words shews that the Evangelist is in the habit of allowing his thought to play around actual words of Jesus, and that he is not writing these discourses without seeking to base his thought on a foundation of actual history. In addition, these particular *ipsissima verba*[4] lead us on to a general consideration of the way in which the doctrine of the Last Things is presented in these Farewell Discourses.

The direction in which the Johannine discourses most completely deviate from the Synoptic utterances is seen in the place given to eschatological

1. Θεωρεῖτε.
2. ὄψεσθε
3. pp. 306 ff.
4. The "little while" may conceivably be a rendering of the "after three days" of Mk. viii, 31. The religious value of the definite statement of time is not arithmetical, but indicates the shortness of the time required in order to produce such a marvellous change in the hearts of the disciples.

ideas. Jesus had promised to return in power and glory on the clouds of heaven, and men's interest in His actual life on earth had tended to decrease. All the Gospels were written partly to counteract this tendency, but the Fourth in particular really grapples with the problem which these visions of the end, these apocalyptic expectations had aroused. " Where is the promise of his coming ? " is a cry that is heard here and there in the New Testament. " How long, O Lord, " How Long ! " arises from the heart of the Church in her times of desperate need. The Fourth Evangelist is the first to realise that this doctrine of the Second Coming of Our Lord, His Parousia, has to be presented in a form which shall be intelligible to the mind of his day ; and also that it ought no longer to be taught in a fashion which directed men's thoughts away from the triumphant activity of the Lord in the present to the dazzling triumph which He had promised in the future. The early Church of the first century lived in daily expectation of the Return of the Lord. Now the destruction of Jerusalem, now the persecution of Nero or Domitian, would suggest that the woes of these days were the birth-pangs of a new world, where Christ would reign as Lord and King. But the Lord had not come, and hopes were disappointed. The cry that rose from men's hearts was a lover's cry. All absences are long to the lover ; ten years, as to the Blessed Damozel, are " ten years of

years," and there are moments in our own experience when we are tempted to take a very long view of the coming of Christ's kingdom; to believe that as it took millions of years to make this world, it will take other millions of years for Christ and His people to remake it. In our own day we must beware of the notion that Christ's kingdom follows the lines of a long, natural evolution, that spiritual law is as uniform as natural law seems to be. On the other hand, it is equally disastrous to be impatient at what we call the slow progress of things. When the longing for the triumph of God's kingdom is associated in the minds of religious people with a conviction that the present condition of things is hopeless, the godless cry arises from men's hearts, "Come, Lord, and end it all." Very often religionists of this type have as little faith in constitutional methods of improving society as the anarchist has. This particular danger must have confronted the Church of the Evangelist's own day.

The Evangelist's method of treating the apocalyptic doctrine of the Second Coming illustrates very clearly his whole attitude towards the sayings of Jesus. All readers of this Gospel will have noticed that the apocalyptic chapters in the Synoptics, especially in Matthew and in Mark xiii, have as their counterpart in the Fourth Gospel, Chapters xiv to xvii. The Jewish Apocalyptic writings, of which the Book of Daniel alone has

been incorporated in the Old Testament, were really a development of Jewish Prophecy. A prophet like Jeremiah was able to conceive of a destiny for the individual, even although the state to which he belonged were destroyed; but the later writers were unable to rise to the spirituality of this conception. Amid the succeeding disasters that befel the Jewish state in the period between the Testaments, there was developed a type of thought which sought to connect the destiny of the righteous individual with a glowing future for his nation. The belief arose in the direct intervention of God which would restore the fallen national fortunes, and glowing pictures were drawn of the nature of this Divine interference in the midst of what seemed the inevitable march of history. The deliverance was looked for "in the clouds of heaven." The imagination of the prophet glowed all the more vividly as the national fortunes ebbed. "The sun shall be turned into darkness and the "moon into blood before that great and terrible "day of the Lord shall come." Even a resurrection of those who had died before the consummation was expected. "And many of them that sleep "in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to ever-"lasting life, and some to shame and everlasting "contempt."[1] Jewish apocalyptic thought was the product of an heroic faith in the power of God.

Our Lord did use such apocalyptic language as

1. Daniel xii, 2.

we find in Mark xiii,[1] and from Daniel He took the title of the Son of Man. What does He mean men to understand by this use of Apocalyptic? Is it meant to be taken literally, and did He really believe and teach that He would actually return in power and glory in a brief time after His Ascension? Here we are dealing with one of the very difficult and most controversial problems of the New Testament—Our Lord's use of apocalyptic language. That language was the language of the finest element in Jewish religion, the religious language of such a home as that in which Our Lord was reared. We have only to read those opening chapters of Luke's Gospel and the words of the Christian hymns that are imbedded in them, or note the figure of aged Simeon "waiting for the consolation of Israel," to understand the real beauty of such a religion. If I were asked to choose a decisive illustration of the way in which Our Lord's mind appropriated such forms of religious expression, I would take that utterance of His when the disciples returned from their mission and told Him of their joyous success, as it is given in Luke's Gospel, "Lord, the very demons obey us in Thy name." "Yes," the Lord replies, "when you were away,[2] I watched

1. Mark xiii is usually understood as a collection of the apocalyptic sayings of Jesus, uttered on different occasions. They are mingled with fragments of some Jewish apocalyptic book, and in some cases filled with a content derived from Christian experience of persecution.

2. Lk. x, 17–20. The tense of the word used, ἐθεώρουν requires this translation.

" Satan as a flash of lightning fall from heaven.
" I have indeed given you authority to tread upon
" serpents and scorpions, and to trample down all
" the power of the enemy ; nothing shall harm you.
" Only, rejoice not because the demons obey you, but
" rejoice because your names are written in heaven."
These words, I think, make it quite clear that Our Lord is using familiar, apocalyptic language to utter his sense of the epoch-making magnificence of their tiny mission out on the waste of an evil world. The words express His sense of the significance His Church will have for the world. I do not intend to enter upon the difficult question whether Our Lord really expected any spectacular manifestation after His Resurrection, and that He expected this to happen soon. Much has been written on this subject, but I cannot bring myself to believe that Jesus understood these apocalyptic conceptions as applied to Himself in any literal sense. No doubt the early Church did, but He did not. The Fourth Evangelist in the Farewell Discourses has faithfully interpreted the religious significance of Our Lord's use of apocalyptic language.

Such forms of religious expression can never cease to have their place. Apocalyptic forms are to be found even in the Fourth Gospel, but the Evangelist, especially in the Farewell Discourses after the Supper, has clothed the thoughts connected with the Return of Jesus and the triumph of His kingdom in tenderer and more personal forms. It

is impossible to think that in the formation of these discourses, he has not had access to some specially intimate sources of information; but as elsewhere he has worked up his material into characteristic forms of his own. We must realise that this is a Gospel of personal experience, and that if the author were a Sadducee, to whom these Pharisaic apocalyptic forms were always foreign, and who was without any personal experience of the place they once occupied in the expression of Jewish religious faith—it is not at all strange that he should find it natural to substitute other forms of thought for the expected return of the Messiah in the clouds of heaven, a belief which in circles reached by the Synoptic Gospels ran a risk of being literally interpreted. The eschatological teaching of Paul also must have created much difficulty in the Greek mind. It has been truly said that to the majority of Christians in the first and second centuries, the Church was merely a temporary institution, a stop-gap, until the Kingdom of God should come. Christ would return in a few years, and inaugurate the great, new, Christian Kingdom. The Evangelist is engaged in laying a surer foundation for the Church than that; in "underpinning the fabric" as one writer puts it. Accordingly, we find all through the Gospel the idea that Eternal Life does not only lie beyond the great consummation, but is here and now in every believer's heart. "This is life eternal to know Thee

"the Father, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast "sent." God in Christ may be "known" in the great prophetic sense even now. He has already revealed Himself in all His power and glory in His Son, Jesus Christ, and that "knowledge" is made accessible to the whole world through the Spirit.

This Gospel is the Gospel of the Spirit. In his own soul the Evangelist was conscious of the Spirit, the Comforter, the Paraclete, abiding in him. Popular expectations of the spectacular way in which Christ would manifest Himself to the world must have been fostered by the apocalyptic passages in the Synoptic Gospels. Here again we have an example of the Fourth Evangelist's reaction against legalistic and literalistic interpretation of Our Lord's teaching. Apocalyptic conceptions of Christ's Person and Work were as foreign to the mind of the Hellenist as they are to our own. The fashion of pictorial thinking—the Jew's unconscious way of evading the prohibitions of the Law against all forms of artistic representation of the Divine—was perfectly understood by one Jew at least in that early age of the Church. The Fourth Evangelist has put the whole Christian world in his debt by his transmutation of Our Lord's apocalyptic language into a speech that is understood by every Christian heart. His conduct in so doing is only the rich fruit of that beatitude which he alone has preserved for us—"Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed."

CHAPTER VII

The Polemical Aims in the Gospel

The Fourth Gospel is not only a constructive presentation of the Christian faith, suited to contemporary needs, but one of the earliest Christian documents which contains both a defence and an exposition of Christianity. In this chapter, the attempt will be made to develop the apologetic considerations which lead the Evangelist to lay stress upon certain aspects in particular of the ministry and teaching of Jesus. We cannot understand fully his affirmations, unless we also know what it is that he means to deny.

There are two main directions in which a strong polemical interest is apparent. These are Jewish contemporary thought and certain forms of religious thought, mainly Stoic, which rendered the presentation of Christian teaching difficult in the Græco-Roman world. Docetism has been already dealt with in Chapter I, and cannot be regarded as a definite system, but rather as a form of thought which affects all the religious thinking of the day.[1]

1. pp. 28 ff.

1. The Anti-Jewish Polemic.

At the end of the first century A.D., Judaism was widespread throughout the Empire, and as has already been noted it was religiously so strong as to be able to dictate terms to the Roman government. The Jews were virtually absolved from Emperor-worship, the official state religion, in deference to their strong, monotheistic convictions. We are told that in the reign of Augustus the Jews formed one fourteenth of the population of the Empire. The Diaspora, which had begun centuries before, on account both of military conquest and in obedience to trade interests, was further stimulated by the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The Jewish nation and the Jewish religion were dispersed over all the known world. The religious centre was definitely shifted from the Temple to the Synagogue. There were synagogues everywhere, which were also centres of Jewish propaganda and of proselytising zeal. "Vast numbers, mostly Asiatic Greeks, must "have adopted the Jewish faith, whilst retaining "their Greek forms of thought. The earliest "preachers of the Christian Gospel found in these "synagogue communities a starting-point for their "message that the Messiah had come in the Person "of Jesus. In this environment, and not in the "more restricted area of controversy depicted in "the Synoptic Gospels, is to be found the key to "the strongly-marked Jewish controversial element "in the Fourth Gospel. In this Gospel the Judaism

" portrayed belongs rather to the Synagogue than " to the Temple, and it is constantly opposed in " fierce polemic."[1]

We shall confine our attention mainly to certain more general aspects of the Evangelist's thought which have an anti-Jewish reference. In all his numerous references to " the Jews " throughout the Gospel, he is really touching a question that must have been a very vital one in the defence of the Christian faith. The Christian Church claimed from the beginning that Jesus Christ was the answer to all the hopes and sufferings of the Jewish race, whose spiritual story is told in the Old Testament. " Abraham rejoiced to see my day." " We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write." A very serious, religious question was raised by the fact that the Jews spurned and despised their Messiah, and had brought about His death ; the rejection of Jesus by the Jews was a difficult point for the earliest Christian apologists to meet. Paul himself deals with the question, and we know how courageously, even desperately, Paul grapples with the unthinkable alternative, from the

1. R. H. Strachan, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 25 Possible Hellenistic influences, at work in the Jerusalem Synagogues of Our Lord's day, are not denied. Dr. Garvie, in his reference to the sentences just quoted. (*The Beloved Disciple*, p.p. 244 ff), ignores my position, made more clear, I hope, in the present work, that the Fourth Evangelist everywhere, like the actual Christian controversialists themselves whom he represents, makes use of the ideas contained in traditional utterances and controversies of Jesus, whilst the form and words employed have a reference to the contemporary situation of the Church in his own day. (cf. pp. 174 ff. *supra*.)

Christian point of view, that God had cast off His own people. The Evangelist is feeling the same problem pressing on his spirit, both from within as a Jewish religious patriot, and from without, as the point of the question was driven home by Jewish enemies of the faith and others. The Jewish rejection of Jesus was not a mere matter for theological and academic discussion. It would meet the Christian Evangelist as he spoke in the streets and in the synagogues of strange cities, and had to be answered. How it was sometimes answered, is seen in the form of some of the long discourses and disputations in the Fourth Gospel. In this Gospel, in line with a tendency that became clearer as time went on and is felt in some of the Apocryphal Gospels, the story of the trial is so presented as to lay the ultimate guilt of the death of Jesus on the Jewish authorities—" He that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin " : side by side with this, there appears, in the thought of this Evangelist, a tragic and haunting sense of the Jewish rejection and shame as poignant as in Paul—for the Evangelist is also a patriotic Jew—" He came unto " his own, and his own received him not." Nathanael is the " Israelite indeed," the type of the genuine Israel, the prophetic " remnant," who finds in Jesus the fulfilment of all his hopes ; the other type is implied, whose rejection of Jesus is attributed to " guile." The Evangelist also introduces us to the Jew who clung with tenacity to

his descent from Abraham, but had missed the entire significance of that spiritual lineage, on which Paul insists in Galatians[1] in his own Rabbinic fashion, and has also so succinctly expressed in Romans[2] by the words, "he is a Jew who is one inwardly."

The prominence given to Judas in the Gospel, and the solemn insistence on his complete possession by the Prince of Evil ("after the sop Satan entered into him")—an insistence which almost passes into animosity, as in the statement that he was a "thief," —is due to an argument against the credibility of the Christian faith, which was not necessarily a peculiarly Jewish weapon. Celsus it is who says, "No good general was ever betrayed," and the choice of Judas was made to reflect upon the moral insight and capability shewn by Jesus in directing His own cause. It is notable that in this Gospel, not Peter, but Judas is identified with "Satan." This emphasis, along with the tragic intensity of the vision in which we see Judas passing out of the lighted upper room into the darkness to carry out his nefarious deed, in spite of the touching appeal of the sop—a mark of special friendship on the Lord's part,—shews how acutely the importance of this apologetic detail was felt. "He went out immediately, and it was night."[3]

1. Gal. iii, 15 ff

2. Rom. ii, 29.

3. Probably also the polemic against exaggerated claims made for the Baptist by a section of his followers is to be classed under this anti-Jewish polemical interest.

There are, moreover, one or two more general questions that emerge. It is remarkable that the Evangelist makes no use of the story of the Virgin Birth. The reason cannot be that to him it was not known. Instead, Jesus is represented as the pre-existent Word, not only immanent in all creation, but now incarnate in a human personality. The doctrine of the Virgin Birth was really intended to emphasise the truly human origin of Jesus,[1] while at the same time it was meant to safeguard the personality of Jesus against the possibility of hereditary taint. The Evangelist secures the same emphasis by his insistence that the "Word became flesh and dwelt among us." Moreover, in none of the Gospels is the true humanity of Jesus more emphasised.[2] There was, however, from the Evangelist's point of view, a certain disability connected with the traditional doctrine of the birth of Jesus, which rendered it defective in view of his argument for an universal Christ who was also the Saviour of the world. It meant that, after all, Jesus was by birth a Jew, born of a Jewish

1. The modern tendency to regard the Virgin Birth as a cardinal doctrine of the Christian faith, without which it is impossible to give full credal expression to the Christian conception of the Person of Jesus, is not supported by the attitude of the Fourth Evangelist. In the Apostles' Creed the emphasis is on "born" and not on "Virgin" in the article, "born of the Virgin Mary." This article introduces the series "suffered under Pontius Pilate . . . buried," all of which are intended to emphasise the historical reality of the human experience of Jesus, from infancy to the grave.

2. Jesus was wearied at the well: He wept at Lazarus' grave; He says on the Cross, "I thirst."

mother and with distinct Jewish nationality. All through the Prologue the eternal and timeless origin, and the universal appeal of Jesus, the Word of God, are accentuated. He is the "light that lighteneth every man." In this connection it is of great interest to note that in this Gospel there is exhibited a more than ordinary emphasis upon the ever-widening breach that existed between Jesus and His own family. We remember how His mother is addressed at the Cana marriage in words that cannot altogether be purged of their aloofness,[1] and we find in Chapter vii the demand of His "brethren" that He should give greater publicity to His work, the significant words being added, "for even His brethren did not believe on Him." The Jewish opponent of the Christian faith was also inclined to insist upon the humble origin of the Christian Messiah; in Chapter vi the "Jews" receive the statement "I am the bread which cometh down out of heaven," with the somewhat contemptuous objection that both His father and mother are well-known. We have already spoken of the interpretation that must be put upon the scene at the Cross, when Jesus gives His mother into the charge of the beloved disciple.[2]

1. The use of the word γύναι must not, in this connexion, be emphasised. In the vocative the word may be used both in admiration (Matt. xv, 28) or in affection (John xix, 26, cf. Theocritus, xv, 12). 'Madam' would be a fairly accurate translation.

2. pp. 56 ff.

The Evangelist was undoubtedly himself a Jew, but it is impossible to avoid the impression that he adopts an attitude of aloofness and antagonism to the Jewish religion in the use of expressions like "your law," "their law."[1] The antagonism is there in spite of such passages as xv, 25, where he speaks of the fulfilment of the law; x, 35, where he says that "the scripture cannot be broken;" or xix, 24, 29, 36, where he emphasises fulfilments of prophecy exemplified in the crucifixion. The crucifixion was the crowning offence committed by the Jews against their own God. The Evangelist's loyalty to the religious system of his own nation was dispersed by this supreme outrage. It is not to be wondered at that he speaks of his own nation as "the Jews," and as the embodiment of all that was opposed to the will of God; for he himself now owed no allegiance save to Jesus Christ, "the Saviour of the world." Everywhere the Jewish opponents of Christianity, who had their spiritual centres in the synagogues, demanded allegiance to their law, the law of a single nation; the Fourth Evangelist sees in the Christian faith the universal law "of grace and reality" which came by Jesus Christ. The aim of his Gospel is to make plain that all that was finest and noblest in the Jewish faith had found a home in Christianity, and that even the Jewish forms of religious thought, under which even Paul had expressed his faith, must give way

1. vii, 19, 23; viii, 17; x, 34; xv, 25.

to forms of thought which were universal and intelligible to a Græco-Roman world.

2. The Anti-Stoic Tendency in the Gospel.

This tendency has an important bearing on the personality of Jesus as presented in this Gospel, and a further and fuller reference will have to be made to it in a following chapter.[1] The question here at issue is the relationship between the human and the divine, man's relation to God. The Stoic Logos, the Universal Reason, was in the end an impersonal and pantheistic conception, in spite of such noble devotional feeling as is expressed in a composition like the *Hymn of Cleanthes*, or some of the utterances of Aurelius or Epictetus.

Epictetus says: "If we had understanding, "ought we not both publicly and by ourselves, to "sing hymns to God, and bless Him, and tell of His "benefits? Ought we not, whether we are digging, "or ploughing, or eating, to sing this hymn to God? "Great is God who has given us these instruments "to till the ground: great is God who has given "us hands, a power of swallowing, an appetite, the "power to grow without knowing it, and to breathe "while we sleep? These things we ought upon "every occasion to celebrate, but the theme of our "greatest and most divine hymn should be that "He has given us the faculty of knowing these "things, and of using them in the proper way.

1. pp. 260 ff.

"Well then, because most of you are blind and "insensible, was it not necessary that there should "be someone to fill this station, and give out[1] for "all men the hymn to God? What else can I do, "a lame old man, but sing hymns to God? If I "were a nightingale, I would do the part of a "nightingale; . . . but I am a reasonable creature, "and it is my duty to praise God. This is my "business. I do it, nor will I ever desert this "post so long as it is given me; and you I call "upon to join in the same song."[2]

The following is a translation of some lines from the "Hymn of Cleanthes":—

> Chiefest glory of deathless Gods, Almighty forever,
> Sovereign of Nature that rulest by law, what name shall we give Thee?
> Blessed be Thou, for on Thee should call all things that are mortal.
> For that we are Thy offspring: nay, all that in myriad motion
> Lives for its day on the earth bears one impress, Thy likeness, upon it;
> Wherefore my song is of Thee, and I hymn Thy power for ever.[3]

It is in itself a remarkable thing that a half-philosophical, half-religious conception of God, such as the greatest of the Stoics had, should have found utterance in song; for that a conception of God should be expressed in song means that it has touched not only the intellect but the heart. This Stoic idea of the relation of man to God, whose

1. Dr. Rendel Harris has said that "the Stoics may give out the hymn, but Christianity raised the tune."
2. *Discourses*, I, 16. (Translation, E. Carter; adapted.)
3. Translated by Crossley. *Golden Sayings of Epictetus*, p. 183 f.

" offspring we are," brings Stoicism into very close relationship with the Christian faith. That Paul should quote this particular tag from Cleanthes to a popular audience at Athens, indicates that such a thought would be readily understood,—as readily as a reference to the " brotherhood of man " by a similar audience to-day.[1] Nothing could indicate more plainly the fact that essential ideas of Stoicism and kindred philosophies were no longer regarded only in academic circles, but had found lodgment in the popular mind.

The idea of men as " children of God " is prominent in the Gospel, in the Prologue and elsewhere, and is a favourite idea in the first Epistle. In the Gospel the ruling idea in the presentation of the consciousness of Jesus is His Sonship, and it is noteworthy that the Evangelist, when he speaks of the sonship of believers, uses another Greek word (τέκνον) ; individual Christians are always called " children of God," while the word " Son " (υἱός) is always reserved for Jesus alone. He it is who makes this sonship possible for us ; He gives us " power " to be called the " children of God." There is, I think, an implicit antagonism in the Gospel to the Stoic conception of man's sonship of God. The Stoic taught that men are not only kindred with God, but that they are actually united to God by a substantial and semi-physical

1. In reality the idea is valuable to the later Stoics, not in the interests of personal religion, but as establishing the universal brotherhood of man.

bond. Conceive God as the ultimate principle of "fire"; men are sparks of this divine fire. Conceive Him as Logos; men are actually derivative "words" of God, with the divine germ as it were within them (σπερματικοὶ λόγοι).[1] In this sense men are called "sons of God"[2]; "each man's intelligence is God and has emanated from Him."[3] In each man there is a "daemon" given him by God to direct his life, which is by no means the same as a man's conscience. Conscience to the Stoic is an intellectual rather than a moral faculty. He held that there was no real barrier to unfettered communion with God, save moral and intellectual blindness, and the awakening of "conscience" is the awakening of reason in a man's soul. A man whose conscience is awake is a man who has learned to live in accordance with "Nature," does not in mere blindness follow her laws, but consents to them. "Live with the gods" says Marcus Aurelius, "and he does live with the "gods who constantly shows to them that his own "soul is satisfied with that which is assigned to "him, and that it does all that the 'daemon' "wishes, which God hath given to every man for "his guardian and guide, a portion of himself. "And this is every man's understanding and "reason."[4]

1. cf. "seed," 1 Jn. iii, 9.
2. Epictetus, *Discourses*, I, IX, 1.
3. Aurelius, *Med.* XII, 26.
4. ib., *Med.* V, 27.

It is by no means suggested that we have here the material out of which we might reconstruct for ourselves the library of the Fourth Evangelist. He is not in antagonism to academic systems of thought, but to those popular religious notions that had penetrated the thinking and coloured the outlook of classes lower than the philosophers—for the philosopher was the real Greek aristocrat. To the Stoic, sonship is an act of will, the deliberate acceptance by an enlightened man of a relationship that already exists. The Evangelist, with a deeper moral insight, asserts that sin is the barrier between man and God, not ignorance. He opposes this Greek conception of " sonship " as strenuously as he opposes a similar—also semi-physically conceived —Jewish conception that men are sons of God because they are " sons of Abraham," and asserts in opposition both to Jew and to Greek that men become children of God by regeneration, " begotten " not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the " will of man, but of God." Sonship is the gift of God through Jesus Christ. The life of Sonship is what he so often calls Life, or Eternal Life, which is the gift of God, not in answer to superior knowledge, but to faith (iii, 16).

3. The Anti-Sacramentalist Note in the Gospel.

There is no account of the institution of the Lord's Supper in the Fourth Gospel. Instead we have the

SCHOOL OF

story of an incident that took place on that same night, the washing of the disciples' feet. In Chapter vi, however, we have some very definite sacramental teaching, of which the true interpretation is very perplexing. "Except ye shall eat "the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, "ye have no life in yourselves. He that eateth my "flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and "I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh "is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, "abideth in me, and I in him. As the living Father "hath sent me, and I live because of the Father, so "he that eateth me shall live by me. . . . He that "eateth this bread shall live for ever."

If we consider the prominence which the Evangelist gives to objections urged by and perplexities created for, the "Jews" and "the disciples" represented as hearing these words, we may be sure of two things: first, that the words just quoted (vi, 52–60) are a form of words current in the Christian Church of his own day and interpreted as "received of the Lord"; second, that many in his own day found the traditional doctrine of the Christian Sacrament of the Lord's Supper hard to understand.

It is noticeable that the passage containing these ideas is prefaced by the following words: "Then the "Jews had a controversy among themselves, "saying, 'How can this man give us his flesh to

" eat ? ' And in verse 60 the statement is made, " When they had listened, many of his disciples " said, ' This is a hard saying to understand ; who " can listen to such talk ? " Again, in verse 66 it is stated that " many of his disciples withdrew and " no longer walked with him." These comments as to the outcome of this particular utterance are enough to shew that the words in question not only presented real difficulty to the Christian Church, but gave an opportunity to contemporary Jewish opponents. The Evangelist never mentions a controversy or perplexity of this kind which is not of vital interest in his own day. The Christian people for whom he wrote his Gospel were themselves perplexed by the words " eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood " ; they were also perplexed regarding that in which the religious value of it all consisted. To those who had been brought up in the Jewish faith, the notion of drinking blood must have caused peculiar difficulty, and there is no conception in the New Testament—written by Jews—harder to account for than this one. The Jew, under his own ritual regulations, was forbidden to make the blood of the animal part of his food ; for the blood is the life, and sacred to God alone. The law itself might " be done away in Christ," as Paul says, but it is not so easy to rid the human mind of the influence of religious associations of ancestral thought.

In one sense, of course, the origin of the idea is

quite plain ; it is derived from the words of Jesus Himself in the Upper Room. At the same time, the words as recorded in the Fourth Gospel, are not only transferred to another place and occasion—a synagogue in Galilee—but are cast in much more direct and rigid phrase, and deprived of the atmosphere of place and time which existed " on the night on which He was betrayed." The words in this Gospel are spoken to a popular audience in Galilee, and it is not to be denied that the sacramental and symbolic may have had a larger place in the ordinary teaching of Jesus than appears in the Synoptic narratives. The mere omission of the words of institution in the Fourth Gospel need cause no perplexity. The institution of the sacrament, and the words that were then spoken, must have been perfectly familiar to the readers, and their omission is quite intelligible on that ground alone. At the same time the omission, read in the light of the incident of the washing of the disciple's feet, which fills the gap, is of some importance as indicating that the Evangelist's own mind is not unduly interested in ritual matters, and that he desires instead to emphasise the ethic and spirit that ought to belong to the communicant, as a result of communion with the living Christ.

It has been already suggested that the form of the words of vi, 52ff, is not the creation of the Evangelist, and that he is not likely first to have

created such a form, and then to have sought to remove objections against it.

As an inference from the plan on which the discourses of Jesus in this Gospel are constructed, the suggestion is here made that the words reported in vi, 52 ff, are based upon some liturgical form which had come into use in the Christian Church when the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was observed. The words are based upon Our Lord's own words, " This is my body," " This is my blood," —and in accordance with the conservative and literalistic tendency noted elsewhere, they had become stereotyped into a liturgical form, and tended to be interpreted in a semi-physical sense. Only thus can we explain the form of the words, " He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood." We already find the beginnings of a liturgical form in 1 Cor. xi, 23 ff. Paul says that " he received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you," by which he means that he had satisfied himself of their authenticity. Paul further says that those who eat and drink unworthily are guilty of a sin against " the body and blood of the Lord." Still more startling and strange are His words " For this cause many among you are weak and " sickly, and not a few are dead." It is entirely erroneous to interpret Paul's sacramental teaching —or John's—as implying that in the very elements themselves there is an inherent efficacy, that the function of the sacrament is *ex opere operato*. At

the same time it is impossible to deny that, both in Paul's and in John's day the distinction between matter and spirit is not so sharply drawn as in ours. Matter and spirit are not so far apart as we think, but wherever sacramental thought is present in every age—and it represents an ineradicable human instinct—there is also present the danger that men begin to emphasise the material side as against the spiritual. In the religious realism of the Græco-Roman world the line of demarcation between symbol and fact was not always distinctly drawn.[1]

If, then, we are here in the presence of a liturgical form, we can readily understand how easily it might be misinterpreted in a magical and materialistic sense. The Evangelist has no intention of suggesting any change in that form; otherwise, I think, he would not have placed these words on the lips of Jesus. He is concerned, however, to repel any realistic sacramentalist interpretation, suggested by a mystical identification of the elements with the actual body and blood of the Lord. Was there any such tendency to sacramentalist interpretation at the time when he wrote?

Let us turn to the letters of Ignatius. Ignatius was practically a contemporary of the Evangelist, and we find words like these in his writing. He speaks of faith as "the flesh of Christ," and love

1. cf. S. Angus, *The Mystery Religions*, p. 46.

as "His blood."[1] No doubt the words are mystical, but there can be equally little doubt that the rite of partaking was to him in some real sense a means of union with Christ, and of assimilating the fruits of His Passion and Resurrection. In accordance with the prevailing religious philosophy of his time he would consider that the very real inward experience of partaking must be represented by some external fact. He utters these notable words, "breaking one bread, which is the medicine of "immortality, and the antidote that we should not "die but live for ever in Jesus Christ."[2] We may notice the continual recurrence of the words throughout this sixth Chapter of the Gospel, "I will raise him up at the last day," and I think that we must detect in them a distinct, controversial emphasis,

1. "Do ye therefore arm yourselves with gentleness and recover yourselves in faith which is the flesh of the Lord, and in love which is the blood of Jesus Christ." *Trall.* 8.

"I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Christ who was of the seed of David; and for a draught, I desire His blood, which is love incorruptible." *Rom.* 7.

2. *Ephes.* 20. The position seems to be established that in the later Mystery-Religions, the deity was merely a guest along with his worshippers at the sacramental meal; there was no conception that through partaking of the food, the communicant was in any magical way united with the God. (cf. P. Gardner, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, IX, 82; S. Angus, *The Mystery-Religions and Christianity*, pp. 128 ff; H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, pp. 256-9). In the Hermetic religions there were no sacraments; for the corporeal would be regarded as evil, and hardly likely to minister to the "spiritual" life. It is, therefore, possible to see in the sacramentalism of Ignatius, a strong Christian protest against the unethical idea that the body is inherently evil, and will not share in the Resurrection. The Fourth Evangelist, in his own way, emphasises the true religious significance of the body, as against the idea that it was "the tomb of the soul," by the repetition of the words, "I will raise him up at the last day."

an insistence on the position that no ritual act can guarantee eternal life, which is the direct personal gift of Christ alone. As has been said, "every "convert was a spiritual epitome of the thoughts "and instincts of countless generations," and even we ourselves carry, without knowing it, as an essential part of our religious thinking, the quintessence of the theological and sacramental thought of the generations that preceded us. We are, no doubt, often quite as unconscious of the fact as the flower, or the animal that has been evolved from earlier forms of life. The modern poet sings:

> Very old are the brooks;
> And the rills that rise
> Where snow sleeps cold beneath
> The azure skies;
> Sing such a history
> Of come and gone,
> Their every drop is as wise
> As Solomon.[1]

And men are also very old; they also breathe a history "of come and gone." The very words that we use are charged with a meaning that represents the history of many generations, and nothing could be more true of our religious vocabulary and outlook. Words "bear upon them all the weaknesses of their "origin, and all the maims inflicted by the prejudices "and fanaticisms of generations of their employers"[2] So it is also with our religious customs and ceremonies. Worship, to the South Italian peasant, is a different thing from what it is to the native of

1. W. de la Mare, *All That's Past.*
2. W. Raleigh, *Wordsworth*, p. 117.

Scotland. They have different spiritual ancestries.

The Fourth Evangelist is writing for a body of readers who carried in their own souls deposits of ancestral methods of a religious thought which cannot conceive of religion without rites and mysteries. The parallel between the Christian rites and those of the heathen was readily recognised by Christians. Justin speaks of the use of the bread and the cup in the mysteries of Mithra, but, like the men of his day, he did not perceive the real connexion between them. To Justin and those who thought like him, the similarities with Christian rites were the work of demons, who had foreseen what the Christian rites would be, and forestalled them with all sorts of pagan parodies.[1] The real connexion is of course that both in the Christian and in the pagan rites expression is being found for the sacramental instincts of the universal human soul. Our Evangelist sees clearly that the real distinction between them is to be found in the nature of the God with whom communion is sought, and in the way in which he communicates himself to the personality of his worshippers—mechanically or dynamically, in the flesh or in the spirit.

The words that follow the passage in question (verses 61–63) are clearly intended to revitalise and to reinterpret the liturgical expressions that have created the difficulty in the minds of Christians, and have laid them open to such attacks as are

1. T. R. Glover, *Conflict of Religions*, p. 159.

suggested in the words, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" It may be conjectured of certain of the popular slanders current regarding the Christian meetings,—as that cannibal practices were engaged in—that they took their origin from the use of some such liturgical forms. The reinterpretation is contained in the words of verse 62, which are very difficult to expound. Our version translates, "What "and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascending up "where He was before? It is the Spirit that "quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." The Ascension of the Son of Man is His entry into that kingdom of the Spirit, where alone true communion is possible. Mary is forbidden to cling to Him before the Ascension. "I am ascending unto my "Father and your Father, unto my God and your "God." Only after His Ascension does He return to hold communion, and enter into fellowship, with his assembled disciples. If we examine the discourse in Chapter vi from its very beginning, we shall see that this spiritual conception of the sacrament as a communion with a Christ of the Spirit dominates the thought all through. "I am the bread of life." "The bread of God is He "that cometh down from heaven and giveth life to "the world." "This is the will of my Father, "that every one that beholdeth (ὁ θεωρῶν)[1] the "Son and believeth on Him hath eternal life, and

1. A special word which denotes an outward vision which penetrates to the inner significance of the object.

" I will raise him up at the last day." The thought is directed as much against certain aspects of Jewish religious mentality as against the Greek type of religious thought. No doubt in many Jewish minds in the religious world of Asia Minor, there were present elements derived from both types of religion. Judaism, in its interpretation of the story of the manna in the desert, is influenced by such a type of thought as is found in Philo. Take the discussion about the Manna. " Our " fathers ate manna in the wilderness, as it is " written, He gave them bread from heaven to " eat." And the reply comes " Your fathers did eat " manna in the wilderness and are dead." In other words, no physical food can confer immortality.[1] The true manna has now been given, and it has come to men from heaven in the person of Jesus; but the opponents cannot understand that Jesus was a heavenly gift, because His origin was so lowly. " Is not this Jesus, the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know ? "

" The bread which I shall give is my flesh for the life of the world." Here again we are once more taken back to the historical reality not only of the life, but of the death of Jesus. The communicant not only " eats His flesh " but " drinks His blood."

1. According to Philo the manna is the symbol of the Logos by which God nourished the soul of his people in the wilderness. It is also interesting to note that Philo speaks of the Logos as God's " seal " (σφραγίς), cf. vi, 27. Paul has in view some sacramental conception of the manna in 1 Cor., x, 1 ff.

The sacrament is not to be interpreted as an extension, as it were, of the Incarnation. The Christian, as Paul says, must bear about in his body not only the living, but the "dying of the Lord Jesus." We assimilate the whole personality of Jesus. The Spirit that is given in the sacrament is a Spirit of life, whose essence is a sacrificial and self-forgetting love. Probably it is on this account that the Evangelist feels that he is not omitting anything that is essential, in his account of the last meal on earth with the disciples in Chapter xiii, when he gives us only that scene where Jesus performs the lowly act of service; where the only details of ritual are the towel wherewith he girded himself, and the plash of water in the basin, and the kneeling at the feet of His own unworthy disciples, including Judas. "If I then, your Lord "and Master, have washed your feet, so ought ye to "wash one another's feet." It is a sacrament of humility, but Jesus did not do what he did in order to teach a lesson. Not even there must such a mechanical idea enter in. He did it because He desired to do it, indeed could not help doing it. "So also" He says to us even in that instinctive action, "ought ye to do." We also must instinctively, having assimilated the spirit that alone profits, stoop to conquer. The acquisition of that spirit is the supreme gift, far more important than outward forms, or the person of the celebrant, which the communicant receives at every

communion table in the Christian Church. Communion, the Evangelist says to us, is the chance of the prize of learning love, and the life of love is the only life that is eternal and abides for ever.

The Anti-Sacramentalist thinking of the Evangelist seems to me further corroborated by various points that emerge in the earlier part of the sixth chapter. There is, for example, the disclosure of the lowly source of the supply thus miraculously increased—a boy's provisions,—as though all superstitious regard of the elements were discouraged. It is also noticeable that Jesus gives the food directly to the multitude, and not through the agency of the disciples, as in the Synoptic story. (Mark vi, 41 and ||). Another point of divergence is that Jesus Himself takes note of the crowd's hunger ; it is not, as in the Synoptic story, brought to His notice by the disciples. These divergences are not mere variations of the tradition, nor are they accidental ; they are deliberate, and intended by the Evangelist to enrich the symbolism of the story. His purpose seems to be to eliminate human or priestly agency in the story, to discourage all magical conceptions of the food ; to emphasise that the spiritual sustenance of the sacrament is not dependent on the men who administer it, nor on the material of the symbols employed. The Evangelist also does not hesitate to relate that the miracle involved did not so impress the multitude that they were prevented from clamouring shortly

afterwards for a " sign "; namely, for some obviously unusual and spectacular manifestation of the Divine Power (verse 31). The importance which is attached to the communication of spiritual power by Jesus, in a way not calculated to impress the senses, is paralleled by the utterance in the story of the marriage feast at Cana, where the actual recipients are ignorant of the source from which the wine has come, " but the servants who drew the water knew." The emphasis that is placed on the source from which the bread comes, is also paralleled by the conversion into wine of water contained in ordinary jars, and intended for the bodily comfort of the guests. Also, the real meaning of the sacrament is symbolised in Chapter xiii, by the sacramental use which Jesus made of the water employed for a similar purpose in washing the disciples' feet. Moreover, the idea of direct communication of spiritual influence by Jesus, and not through the agency of the disciples, is in line with such utterances as " I will raise him up at the last day " ; " I am the bread of life." The bread of the sacrament is not " the medicine of immortality." The whole thought of the chapter, both in its narrative and its teaching, is bent on directing men's minds away from the means, human or material, to the source of all spiritual power in Jesus Himself. The Christian religion depends neither on magic nor on any devolution of divine power to a priesthood. Its essential meaning

is that Jesus Himself is the Bread of Life. "The "spirit it is that quickeneth, the flesh (the material "symbol) profiteth nothing: the words that I "speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are "life."

An interesting question is raised by the fact that the Evangelist's version of Jesus' sacramental teaching is given in connexion with the miracle of the Feeding of the Multitude, and not in connexion with the happenings on the last night on earth in the upper room. The Evangelist must have some definite purpose in view in thus transferring to the Galilean hill-country the occasion on which the Christian sacramental teaching was given, and in thus placing it in the setting of a Galilean landscape. This Gospel makes clear the historical fact that the Last Supper took place on the evening before the Passover day, and in verse 4 it is directly stated that while the time of this miraculous meal in Galilee is the eve of the Jerusalem passover, its occasion is not determined by that event, nor is the sacramental teaching here described connected therewith. It is by no means to be asserted that sacramental teaching was foreign to the mind of Jesus, or denied that He spoke in this sense on other occasions than in the upper room; but it is remarkable that in this Gospel, the teaching of the upper room is occupied exclusively with the direct personal relationship of the disciple to his Master, and with the moral responsibility that inevitably

follows therefrom; that elsewhere, on another occasion, such full teaching is given as in Chapter vi, on the meaning of a sacrament which already in the Evangelist's time had become part of the Church's ritual, and was exclusively connected with the final moments in Christ's life. Can any reason be assigned which would weigh with the Evangelist in thus altering the direction of Christian thought?

The interesting suggestion has been made[1] that the situation which the Evangelist has in view is that which would necessarily be created by the separation of the Eucharist from the Love Feast or *Agape*, of which it originally was a part. The separation of the two would be rendered necessary as the numbers of the Christian Church increased. The practical difficulty would emerge of providing both food and drink for an increasing number, so long as the social meal and the Eucharist were combined. It is remarkable that two miracles in the Fourth Gospel should be concerned, one with a threatened failure of a wine supply (ii, 3) the other with a threatened shortage of bread, "Whence shall we buy bread that those may eat?" (vi, 35). It will readily be felt that the perplexity thus involved would speedily pass into a problem which raised the deepest theological questions. Granted that the Eucharist had come to be observed apart from the common meal, it is intelligible that

1. H. T. Purchas, *Johannine Problems and Modern Needs*, pp. 34 ff.

superstitious and magical ideas of communion with the Divine by means of food and drink, specially consecrated for the purpose, would find ready entrance into the minds of uninstructed Christians. The story of the miraculous feeding of the multitude would most fittingly lend itself for the purpose of giving, by means of an historical medium, sound teaching on the subject of the Christian sacrament. It was unnecessary to retell this story in the Fourth Gospel unless in so doing the Evangelist intended some important symbolical teaching to be conveyed. The story has a place in all three Synoptic Gospels, and no detail of any importance is added in the Fourth. The value of the story for the Fourth Evangelist lies in the wealth of symbolical detail which it provides.

It is suggested that the Evangelist has in view the practical problem raised by the continued observance of the Eucharist as part of the social meal; but the Evangelist's solution can hardly be said to be adequate, if this practical problem is all that he has in view. It must be assumed that the impossibility of providing a social meal every time the Eucharist was observed would, as time went on and the membership of the Church increased, of itself suggest the solution in the discontinuance of the social meal on most occasions. It is no solution of a practical problem of ways and means to say that Jesus, in the days of His flesh, multiplied five barley-loaves and two small fishes.

Those officials who were concerned with the provision of hospitality could scarcely be encouraged to expect a repetition of the material miracle. Rather must we assume that the Evangelist has in view the spiritual problem presented by the sacramental use of bread and wine. The bread he has in view is "the bread of life." In his narrative, there is no mention of the fish when it is related that the twelve baskets of fragments were collected.[1] This is interesting, inasmuch as it indicates that the Evangelist does not regard fish as a sacramental symbol; in his mention of the abundance that is still left after the large multitude has been fed, mention is made of the bread alone. The writer's whole mind is concentrated on the spiritual abundance that remains after the meal has taken place. The sacramental meal is only one method of communion with the living Christ; and the multitude who followed Jesus to the other side are rebuked because they followed Him for the reason "that they ate of the loaves and were filled"; they had forgotten the abundant spiritual resources that were left, symbolised by the heaped baskets of fragments. They are also rebuked because they had not seen in these, "signs," presumably of the abundant and manifold grace of God, present in the Person of Jesus Himself.

That this is no fanciful interpretation is shewn by

1. cf. Mark vi, 43.

the story of the Walking on the Water which intervenes. As has already been said, this Evangelist would not have retold a story so well-known as the miraculous meal unless he had regarded it as containing a deep, symbolical significance; it is still more impressive that he should also re-tell the story of the Walking on the Water, which in Matthew and in Mark directly follows the miracle,—a procedure which can only indicate that it possessed for him a similar symbolic value, especially in conjunction with the former story. His omission of certain details, found in the Synoptic Gospels, is of no real importance; and one detail, which is added, has given great perplexity to interpreters of the Gospel, namely the words, "And immediately the ship was at the land whither they were going." There can be little doubt that for this Evangelist the boat on the stormy sea is a symbol of the Church in a situation of persecution and danger. Mark (vi, 52) has already suggested a connexion between the faithless fears of the disciples and their forgetfulness of the power displayed in the previous miracle (cf. viii, 14–21); the Fourth Evangelist develops and deepens this connexion still further, and in this story of the storm, used as an introduction to the discourse which follows, he asks us to behold a symbol of the continual presence of Jesus with His Church, apart from His presence in the Eucharist; and in particular of His power and willingness to aid His people in their times of danger and stress.

In these experiences He gives Himself to them as really as in the Eucharist:—

> I met a preacher then I knew, and said:
> "Ill and o'erworked, how fare you in this scene?"
> "Bravely!" said he, "for I of late have been
> Much cheered with thoughts of Christ, *the living bread.*"
>
> O human soul! as long as thou canst so
> Set up a mark of everlasting light,
> Above the howling senses' ebb and flow,
>
> To cheer thee, and to right thee if thou roam—
> Not with lost toil thou labourest through the night!
> Thou mak'st the heaven thou hop'st indeed thy home.[1]

This miracle of the storm is well associated with the previous story. The former suggests that the body of Jesus is not subject to the laws which govern the material conditions of other bodies. It is so represented in order to teach that He is able to communicate Himself to His disciples in countless ways. The crowd are ignorant of this spiritual truth: "Rabbi," they say, "when camest thou thither?" His disciples received Him into the boat willingly, all their fears quelled, and "immediately the boat was at the land for which they were making." There is a heightening of the miracle undoubtedly, if the narrative is taken as a bare statement of fact, but we are not at liberty to regard the Johannine narratives only as bare statements of fact. The meaning is that Jesus, received into the heart of His Church, guarantees the success of all its undertakings, no matter in what adverse circumstance it may be involved. The uninstructed multitude, when they see Jesus

1. From M. Arnold's Sonnet, *East London.*

standing among them, are in the presence of a miracle which, instead of enlightening, only reveals their blindness. They had already, in their partaking of the meal, been given a sign which indicated the presence of the inexhaustible resources of God in Christ, but their thoughts still linger around the symbol and have not grasped the great reality. They stand for a type of religion which can find no assurance, save in sensuous appeal. "I am the bread of life. He that cometh to me "shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me "shall never thirst."

CHAPTER VIII

Lazarus

Criticism of the Fourth Gospel, as has already been said, has been pointed far too exclusively in the direction of attempts to discover objective, historical fact. Nowhere has this tendency been more marked than in what has been written regarding the Lazarus story. There can be no doubt that underlying it is a substratum of historical fact. At the same time, to attempt to treat the Lazarus story as it stands, as pure matter of fact, is to turn poetry, "the highest form of truth," into prose which is incapable of conveying certain kinds of truth. Probably the Evangelist regards the story as having happened as he describes it, and as he reconstructs it from the material available. One thing, however, is certain. His own attention is focussed, as he would focus the attention of his readers, much more upon the personality of Jesus displayed in the narrative than upon the details of the miracle. The majesty of Our Lord's personality completely overshadows the figure of Lazarus upon whom this stupendous miracle has been wrought. "The words, 'Loose him and let him go,' strikingly "as they close the scene, are the natural ending "rather to a mind rivetted intensely on the

"manifestations of Christ's personal glory, than to "one painting the startling awfulness of the event "itself. It is the calmness of Christ's majesty, not "the awe of the grave giving up its dead, which "these words express."[1] We may easily mistake facts for truth, and forget that truth may be independent of what we call hard facts, accessible if not to our own senses, at least to someone else's, who has been an eye- and ear-witness of what has actually happened. We must distinguish the spiritual truth, which is abiding, from the historical accuracy of the narrative in which it is presented. It is probable that the Evangelist found the story of the raising of Lazarus in his sources, which were partly independent of the Synoptic tradition. He brings to it the same type of mind as meets us in the story of the marriage at Cana. The turning of water into wine has for him the same creative significance as the summoning of Lazarus alive from his grave.

There is also another respect in which the story appeals to him as suited for his purpose. He employs it as a crowning illustration of the truth so prominent in the Gospel, and so characteristic of its conception of Our Lord's personality,—that the determining influences in the death of Jesus have a Divine and not a human origin. All suggestions as to his conduct must come from God and not from man. The Christ of the Fourth Gospel thinks

1. R. H. Hutton, *Theological Essays*, p. 186.

not as man thinks, but as God thinks, " savours of the things that be of God and not of men." The serious illness of His friend Lazarus, and the urgent message from the sisters draw His heart to Bethany. Jesus will not expose His life to danger, even at such an urgent bidding, unless He knows clearly that it is the will of God. Hence the reason of the delay in verse 6. It has already been noticed that this verse is connected by a significant " therefore " with the words that precede, " Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus," as though the Evangelist would emphasise the tender human motive that urged Him to go. After an interval of two days, He decides to make the journey. We may compare what happens in ii, 3–7, and the words in vii, 6–10. These refusals to be guided by human suggestion are all in keeping with that *motif* which is heard again and again, in one form or another, in the Gospel: " I lay down my life of myself ; no man taketh it from me." When His mind is made up, and " He set his face stedfastly toward Jerusalem," not only Peter, but all the disciples seek to turn Him from doing the will of God. " If he is asleep that is a good sign ; he will recover : there is no need of your going." The reply in verses 9–10 is a gentler one than that given to Peter on a similar occasion. It is calmer and more majestic, in keeping with the personality of Christ as depicted in the Gospel, but none the less decisive and significant. There is nothing to

fear, Our Lord says, for one who walks in the light of God's will and purpose, clearly ascertained; "Are there not twelve hours in the day? If "any man walk in the day he stumbleth not, because "he seeth the light of this world. But if a man "walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there "is no light in him."

The general position taken up by the present writer is that the material of the Lazarus story has been chosen by the original Evangelist (J), out of the traditions available to him, not for its historical value but for its dramatic significance. The story suggests in every line of it a picture of Jesus as the Lord of Life, which forms a fitting climax to His ministry. If the turning of Water into Wine is the first of miracles, in Origen's sense,[1] the Raising of Lazarus is the last. These two miracles are the Alpha and the Omega of the Ministry. The Lazarus story is the culminating sign in which Our Lord's glory is displayed, and forms an appropriate and impressive logical transition to the story of the Cross, in which, to human eyes, Death had gained dominion over Him, and the machination and plotting of evil men had triumphed.

There are, however, three leading difficulties which emerge in the course of the story, and seem to indicate editorial revision. (1) *The publicity of the event*, and the fact that the incident is represented as the immediate occasion of the final outburst of

1. p. 91, note.

hostility on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities. The complete silence of the Synoptic Gospels as to the story is, therefore, disconcerting. (2) *The apparent inconsistency in the explanation of the delay* referred to in verse 6. (3) *The ambiguity in the description of the relationship between Lazarus and the two sisters.* We shall now consider these three difficulties in order, and offer the suggestion that a solution can be reached only by the hypothesis that nowhere in the Gospel is the work of an editor more pronounced than in this story.

(1) *The publicity of the event.* In the Gospel the incident is the pivot on which the whole succeeding narrative in Chapter xii turns. It is the occasion of the final outburst of hostility on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities, thereby supplying the place of the Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics. We have already noted that the Editor of the Gospel has given the Cleansing of the Temple a place in his chronological scheme, although in the original Gospel its place was purely ideal. Accordingly he has to find, keeping in view his purpose that the Gospel shall be chronological, a substitute, which he finds in the story of the restoration of a dead man to life from the very tomb itself. R has really given to the story the important and critical place it occupies, and has made of this dramatic incident a great public event, for which there is absolutely no place in the development of events in the Synoptic story.

The first sign of what has happened is found in xi, 2, where there is a curious forward reference to an event not yet recorded. That in itself indicates that the Editor has a document before him, and that he desires historically to connect the two happenings. It is extremely unlikely that the original Evangelist would thus refer to an incident not yet described. He would be much more likely to refer back in Chapter xii to the Mary of Chapter xi. Evidently R, rightly supposing that the Raising of Lazarus is at least in part the explanation of the outburst of devotion on Mary's part, is anxious to emphasise the connexion. The original Evangelist, no doubt, implies that the two Maries are identical, but he tells the story of the Anointing in order to point out that one at least among the Lord's followers realised with overwhelming gratitude and penetrating sympathy that, in giving life to Lazarus, Jesus had laid down His own life.

Verse 19 introduces us to a conception that is prominent in R's presentation of the story, and is intended to emphasise the publicity of the whole miracle. The verse is an interruption of the sequence of thought. Throughout Chapter xi and in Chapter xii, we are made familar with a crowd, consisting of "many of the Jews" (11$^{19, 31, 42, 45, 46}$, 12$^{9, 17, 18}$). The movements of this crowd are interesting. It is at first distinct from the crowd of pilgrims at the feast. It consists of "Jews" who come from Jerusalem on a visit of

condolence to Martha and Mary. These "Jews" follow Mary as she goes to meet Jesus (11[31]). They are in tears, in sympathy with Mary (11[33]). It is for their sake that Jesus utters the prayer at the tomb, not for His own (11[42]). They are ultimately divided into "believers" and "unbelievers," who report what has happened to the ecclesiastical authorities (11[45, 46]). In reinforced numbers (ὁ ὄχλος πολύς) they reappear at the house in Bethany, in order to gaze on Lazarus (12[9]). They take a prominent part in the demonstration at the Triumphal Entry, which R evidently regarded as largely originating in the Raising of Lazarus.

In xii, 12–16, a knowledge of the Synoptic story is presupposed. This is indicated by the use of the definite article, "the branches of the palm-trees." R regards this crowd as part of the *mise-en-scène*, necessary to his interpretation of the Lazarus story. In the original narrative, the only crowd referred to would be the crowd of Passover pilgrims (12[12]), in which R merges the spectators who witnessed the miracle at the grave (12[17, 18]). It is noticeable that in xi, 47, "many signs" are mentioned, as though the "therefore" were meant to gather up a result that was produced by Jesus' whole ministry, and the Lazarus miracle were not the only cause of hostile action. This would suggest that verses 45, 46, are also the work of R. He is anxious, not only to identify the spectators of the miracle with a portion of the pilgrim crowd, but

also to indicate that the Lazarus miracle was the real cause of Jesus' arrest.

It may be granted that the household in Bethany was by no means poor, or unlikely to have a large circle of friends; Mary's offering in xii, 3 would indicate as much. It would, therefore, be natural that the death of Lazarus should excite a widespread sympathy in Jerusalem, and that a considerable number of friends should arrive to pay visits of condolence. It is, however, somewhat remarkable that these should be described in xi, 19, by the title "the Jews." In verse 18, it is evidently implied that the mourners come from Jerusalem. The title "Jerusalemite" is elsewhere used in the Gospel for a native of the city (7, 25; cf. Mk. 1, 5). The term "the Jews" is rather indefinitely used in the Gospel for the opponents of Jesus. As a rule, they are not distinguished as Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, and "common people," as in the Synoptics. R apparently seizes upon the picture of the mourners who came to condole with Martha and Mary and were witnesses of the miracle which he found in the original Gospel, and has ultimately presented these as a collection of Jews, some of whom are hostile and some friendly. Those who were hostile reported to the authorities what Jesus had done (verse 46). In verse 31 it is represented that Martha's desire that Mary and her Lord should be alone (verse 28) is thwarted, and the mourners accompany her in order to join in the

wailing at the tomb. In verse 42 this company of mourners has become a crowd (ὄχλος) for whose sake the prayer of verse 41 is uttered. Here it is impossible to escape the impression that R feels that it is inconsistent with the majesty of Jesus' personality that He should utter a prayer on His own behalf for the Father's help in the miracle He was about to perform. The prayer becomes theatrical, and is uttered for the sake of "the crowd that stood by." Again in xii, 9–11, 17, this crowd is practically identified with the crowd of pilgrims. It is suggested that xi, 19, 31, and 42, and xii, 17, 18 are the composition of R, based probably upon statements about a company of mourners, contained in the original document that lay before him.

We now come to the second difficulty in the narrative.

(2). *R's conception of Jesus' delay.* If the tendency of R to represent the miracle as spectacular, and to make of it a critical turning-point in the career of Jesus, is seen in his treatment of the crowd, the same tendency is at work in verses 39b, 40. ("Martha, the sister of him that was dead . . . to see the glory of God.") R's interpretation of Jesus' delay is that it is intended to give time for Lazarus to die and to be buried, in order that, by a stupendous miracle, the faith of the disciples should be strengthened. As in verse 17, so in the verses just quoted, the emphasis is laid

on the fact that Lazarus had been four days dead. The time is evidently based on a calculation of the time needed to journey to Bethany from the place mentioned in x, 40. Also, according to the Jewish belief, after three days had elapsed, the spirit had finally left the body. "The soul of the departed "lingers about the body for three days, ready to "return into it if possible; on the fourth day it "definitely takes its departure because it sees that "the countenance has wholly changed."[1] Martha's gruesome words in verse 39 express the same idea.[2] Here we have the same type of mind at work in an apologetic interest as appears in the narrative of xx, 2–10.[3]

(3). *The ambiguity in the description of the relationship between Lazarus and the two sisters.* In particular, xi, 1, 2, gives food for thought. The description of Lazarus, as "of Bethany, of the village of Mary and Martha her sister," does not directly state that Lazarus is their "brother," although that is clearly implied elsewhere throughout the story. ἀδελφός can be used not only of a uterine relation but also of a near kinsman. (Gen. 14^{16}; 1 Sa. 20^{29}; 2 Ki. 10^{13}). The form of the message to Jesus in verse 3 does not suggest that Lazarus is a brother in the literal sense. Lazarus is there described as "he whom thou lovest." In verse 1, he is merely spoken of as living in the

1. cf. Schmiedel, Art: *John, Son of Zebedee*, Ency, Bib 2520.
2. See Appendix, under 11^{39} (2), p. 239.
3. pp. 280 ff.

same village. Again in verse 5, Lazarus is not stated to be the brother by birth of the sisters; but in verse 2, which on other grounds may be regarded as editorial, Mary is said to be Lazarus' sister. In verse 19, the mourners arrive "to comfort the sisters concerning their brother." It is apparent that R regards Lazarus as the brother of Martha and Mary in the literal sense. It is also noticeable that he is at pains in verse 2 to emphasise the relationship as regards Mary.

Probably in the original narrative, as verses 3 and 5 indicate, Lazarus was a near kinsman of the sisters. In verse 21, Martha speaks of him as her brother. "If thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." It is remarkable that Mary should use exactly the same words in verse 32, as Martha.[1] It is possible that in verse 32 the words "If thou hadst been here, my brother had not died" are inserted by R, in order again to emphasise the birth relationship with the other sister, as he has done in verse 2. At all events, the way in which Lazarus is mentioned in verses 1, 3, and 5 is somewhat strange, if all three are really regarded as children of the same mother. Moreover, if Lazarus was only a near kinsman and not an inmate of the home in Bethany, the silence regarding him in the

1. If the words λέγουσα . . . ἀδελφός are omitted the scene is made much more impressive and much more moving. Mary falls at Jesus' feet, and utters not a word. She "makes her face a darkness." Jesus (verse 33) does not reply to any words of hers, but is deeply moved by her grief.

Lucan story would be more intelligible. It is to be noticed also that in verses 9–11, which have also been ascribed to R, the "crowd" evidently expects to see Lazarus in the house of Martha and Mary, as in his own home.[1]

The Lazarus story is the noblest and most magnificent product of the Evangelist's dramatic imagination. Beneath and behind the picture there lies some story of raising from the dead, like the Jairus story; but as even the most conservative critics to-day would admit, all the effects are dramatically heightened, and the interaction of events is dramatically presented. We might almost say that the dramatic intensity of the writer, as he realises the symbolic power of the whole picture of Jesus as the Lord of Life, exercises such pressure on his mind in the Lazarus story that—especially in the closing scene where the reanimated body, "bound hand and foot," comes forth from the tomb at the Lord's command—the narrative passes into vision.[2] As in the story of the marriage at Cana, and of the pressure His brethren exerted upon Him

1. We may here summarise those portions of the narrative in Chapter xi and xii, where it is suggested there has been editorial revision, xi, 2, 15, 17, 19, 31, 32, 39b–40, 42, 45–6, 54; xiii, 1b, 9–11, 17–18.

2. Note the contrast—probably not unintentional—drawn in the editorial account in xx, 2-10 of the vision which the two disciples see in the empty tomb. Jesus has left the grave-clothes behind. It was not necessary that of Him it should be said, "Loose him and let him go." Probably there has been some editorial interference (e.g., the words, "bound hand and foot . . . napkin") with the figure of Lazarus emerging from the grave, in order to emphasise that he emerged with an actual human body, and not as a phantom, cf. pp. 285 ff.

to declare Himself (7, 2-10), so here the need of beloved friends is represented as a powerful motive. But is it God's will that He should yield to the pressure? The message comes that a beloved friend is seriously ill at Bethany. "Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus," says the Evangelist. It was strong human affection that drew Him to Bethany. We are startled when he adds, "He *therefore* remained where He was three days." All the time of this delay Lazarus, for lack of the Healer's presence is dying! Why? "Bethany is nigh unto Jerusalem about fifteen furlongs." It was in the danger zone. "The Jews seek to stone thee, and goest thou thither again," say the disciples, and thus bring to bear a fresh inducement to ignore the call of human need, because of their affection for their Master. The dilemma was very real. Is Lazarus' illness the Divine signal that the "hour" is at hand? Is it God's will that He should thus expose Himself to death? Jesus waits on the revelation of the will of God these three days. "I lay down my life of myself; no "man taketh it from me. I am come to do not "what even the loving human will would have me "do, but God's will." How this refrain runs through all the Gospel! And then God glorifies Him: owns Him as the Lord of Life, in the raising of Lazarus. "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory "of God, that the Son of God may be glorified through "it." The words "Come and see," of xi, 34, are

meant as an invitation to view the sublime mystery of the vanquishing of death. Abbott[1] points out that "Come and see" is commonly used as a preface, in Rabbinical writers, to the statement of some profound mystery. The reply of the mourners is really given by them as unconscious instruments of God, where they invite Him to "'come and see' the apparent triumph of death; "unconsciously inviting Him to the highest "manifestation of His own divine and life-giving "power in triumphing over death."

1. *Joh. Vocabulary*, 1609.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VIII

Grammatical and Linguistic Points in Chapters XI and XII, Peculiar to R Passages.

We have a striking series of points falling under this head, some corresponding to those that have emerged in other portions of R's work. The following may be noted, including some already touched upon :—

11[19]. *πρὸς τὴν Μάρθαν καὶ Μαριάμ*, where the omission of the second article is peculiar (Abbott, J. Gr. 1990–1).

11[31]. 1. Ἰουδαῖοι for Ἱεροσολυμεῖται (cf. 12[9]).

2. *ταχέως* Only here in Johannine literature. Elsewhere *τάχιον* (13[27], 20[4]). Cf. *ταχύ* in 11[29].

3. *ἀνέστη* (11[31]), "rose up." The verb is always used elsewhere in the Gospel of rising from the dead (11[23, 24]).

11[39]. 1. *τετελευτήκοτος*. A Synoptic word for death, found only here in the Gospel. Cf. *ὁ τεθνηκὼς* (11[44]).

2. *τεταρταῖος*. A *hapax legomenon* in the N.T. The word is used not only of one who is four days dead (Herodotus 2, 89), but also of a "quartan" fever (Plato, *Tim.* 86 A). Is it possible that Lazarus died of a *τεταρταῖος πυρετός*, and that this fact, embodied somewhere in the Johannine material, perhaps in an utterance of Martha's, led R to interpret it as suggesting that he had been dead four days? *τεταρταῖος* is used without *πυρετός* in the Aphorisms of Hippocrates (5, 70).

3. *ὄζει*. *hapax legomenon* in N.T.

11[40]. 1. No such actual words of Jesus are recorded in the previous narrative.

2. *δόξα* is a signal manifestation of the power and majesty of God. In 11[4] the 'glory of God' is manifested in the "glorifying" of Jesus on the Cross, in the Johannine sense. In v.[40] the "glory of God" is manifested in the stupendous miracle.

11[42]. *περιεστῶτα*. In this sense, only here and in Ac. 25[7], in the N.T.

11^{54}. 1. παρρησία, here used in a local sense="in public"; not in the psychological sense of "confidently," "plainly," or "with boldness." In $7^{13, 26}$, 18^{20} the meaning is more than "publicly," and also contains the sense of "with boldness," or "conviction." The use in v.^{54} is unique in the N.T.

2. Ἰουδαίοις = "citizens of Jerusalem"; as contrasted with inhabitants of the χώρα (vv.$^{54, 55}$) or country districts. Cf. 11^{31}.

3. ἐκεῖθεν only here and in 4^{43} in this Gospel.

4. Ἐφραὶμ λεγομένην πόλιν. In every other instance of λεγομένην so used, the proper name comes after, and not before (cf. 5^{2}).

5. ἔμεινεν μετά. Nowhere else; παρά in 1^{39}, 14^{17}.

12^{1}. The words ὅπου ἦν . . . Ἰησοῦς belong to R. R is concerned to keep prominent the critical incident of the Raising of Lazarus (cf. v.^{9}).

12^{11}. Note the emphatic assertion that Lazarus is the cause of many withdrawals from the ecclesiastical party (δι' αὐτόν). A similar emphasis is found in v.^{18}, in the construction τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον, where τοῦτο is given a prominent place in the sentence.

CHAPTER IX

The Death of Jesus

In the thought of all the New Testament writers, the death of Christ occupies the central place in their estimates of His Person. That, however, is not the same thing as to say that all these writers express what the death of Christ is conceived by them to stand for in Christian experience, in the same way, or in the same form of words. That Our Lord regarded His own death as the climax of His life of service is clearly shewn in His words, "The Son of Man is come, not to be ministered "unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom "for many." If we were to seek for a form of words which would express most nearly Our Lord's thoughts about His own death, we would probably find them in the hymn of the Suffering Servant of the Lord in Isaiah liii. The Fourth Evangelist seems himself to indicate this in the summary that he gives at the end of his twelfth chapter, of the Life as he has just depicted it. "And though He "had done so many signs in their presence, they "did not believe in Him, that the word of "Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled; 'Lord, "who hath believed our report, and to whom "hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?'"

And we may be sure that he means us to finish the chapter. In His own consciousness, the Death of Jesus had a real and objective redemptive value for men.

The two chief forms in which the death of Jesus is presented in the New Testament are the Pauline, and the Johannine. Both points of view in so far as they originate theories are conceived partly as following the lines directed by personal and individual experience, and partly in obedience to the necessities of apologetic controversy. So far as individual experience goes, Paul develops the subject from the standpoint of the Pharisee; his utter failure to keep the law had aroused within him a sense that obedience to legal precepts was a hopeless method of attaining righteousness, and he was made conscious of an evil principle within him which was at war with God. He approaches the question from the point of view of righteousness. When he theorises about the death of Christ, he does so largely in opposition to the antinomian position which would interpret the sonship conferred by the grace of God as a liberty to sin that grace might abound. In opposition to this, he recalls his readers to the sense of the personal relationship that exists between them and God, "the grace in which they are standing"[1]—and reminds them that they owe their allegiance to the God who has set them free, and no longer to the power of

1. Rom. v, 2.

evil within. Both loyalty and gratitude, and the sense of deliverance, are the Christian motives.

John, on the other hand, approaches the death of Christ from another angle, and with a somewhat different personal experience. If this writer was originally a Sadducee—and we have seen that there are certain strong reasons for believing that he was[1]—his whole spiritual history was of another kind. The Sadducees were largely men of the world, who looked, with a far kindlier eye than the Pharisee, upon the culture of the world in their own age, and were more open to its intellectual influences. Less capable of and less accustomed as they were to the habit of religious introspection than the Pharisee, the impact of Jesus Christ on a Sadducaic mind, as we might expect, would be in contrast with the impression made upon the Pharisee. The Sadducee would, of course, like every Jew, regard with repulsion the idea of a crucified and suffering Messiah; the fact that Jesus had been condemned as a criminal would excite in his breast the same mingled aristocratic and moral repulsion as formerly, before his conversion, in the heart of Paul. At the same time, however, there are evidences in this Gospel, as we have also seen, that its author had had special opportunities of observing the happenings at the trial of Jesus; that he had already some kind of connection with the little band of disciples, was indeed in some such relationship to these as

1. pp. 157 ff.

Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathea. He realises to the full the personal hatred and ecclesiastical prejudice and naked self-interest that governed all these proceedings; for he had seen these actually at work.

He did not enter the kingdom by the same door as Paul, whose particular experience was not the norm for all. The experience of the trial and the appearance made there by Caiaphas had deeply impressed him, and he who as a Sadducee disbelieved in predestination, beheld Caiaphas in the grasp of a divine power using him and his accomplices as its instrument, and heard him utter words about "one man dying for the people," whose full significance he did not then understand. Subsequently the Evangelist came to know that Jesus died "not for the Jewish people only, "but that the children of God scattered abroad "might be gathered into one." He had, as it were, been born again into a new world of spiritual reality, and had seen the Kingdom of God. He had been "born blind." The Fourth Evangelist is like a man who has for the first time been made to see the spiritual world through the light of Christ; the darkness of the human soul against the light of the world of truth. "One thing I know that whereas I was blind now I see," is, like other utterances in the Gospel, of autobiographical interest.

What, then, does "sin" mean to him? Hitherto

—thinking perhaps in terms of a philosophy made familiar to him by contact with the thought of the Gentile world—he had seemed to himself to have been inhabiting a world of untruth, unreality, darkness, and he had been born from above into a world of truth, of reality, of light. The forms and ceremonies of his ancestral faith seemed to him as dead as they were to Paul. He did not, after he became a Christian, accuse himself of mere intellectual ignorance, but of sheer disbelief. To him disbelief in Jesus Christ, and all that had been revealed through Him, was the crowning sin. It is quite true that there is an absence in this Gospel of that tenderer relationship of Christ to the lost and the fallen, which lights up the pages of the Synoptic Gospels with such pathos. The Good Shepherd is without the sheep upon His shoulders. Yet the Fourth Evangelist is no stranger to the grace and generosity of God. He, too, can quote the language of Paul. "Whosoever committeth sin is the slave of sin"; he, too, can think of the supreme test of the Christian, that he must stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and be requited for his deeds, whether they be good or evil. "The hour "cometh when all that are in their graves shall hear "His voice and come forth, those that have done "good to the resurrection of life, those that have "done evil to the resurrection of judgment." It is surely an exaggeration to say, as Professor E. F. Scott does, that in this Gospel "sin is not connoted

"as a positive principle, but as a privation, a "limitation. To the mind of John, sin in itself "involves no moral culpability." There are always those in whom moral culpability is never very acute until they come to know Christ, and this Evangelist may well have been lacking in that sense of sin which distinguishes Paul in his pre-Christian days. He is, however, in his form of expression not inconsistent with the essential meaning of Paul's doctrine of justification by faith, and not at variance with Paul's joyous sense, of the Spirit that enables the Christian to say "Abba, Father." He is raised from the position of a slave to that of a son in the house. The door that was opened for him into that world of spiritual reality, of grace and truth, was the Lord Himself,—"I am the Door;" and only in living communion with Christ can he continually assure himself of the reality of such a manner of love,—"Behold what "manner of love hath been bestowed upon us that "we should be called the sons of God."

What, then, is the real significance of the Death of Christ to this Evangelist?

1. This Evangelist differs from the others in assigning the date of the crucifixion to the day before the Passover. There is, indeed, some ambiguity in the Synoptic record, but none in the Fourth Gospel. It is clearly indicated that Our Lord suffered on the Day of the Preparation for the Passover Feast, and in this he is historically correct.

When, however, the Evangelist thus goes out of his way either to correct or to amplify the Synoptic tradition, we are safe to assume that he has more than an historical interest in so doing, and that his real interest is doctrinal.[1] His doctrinal interest is, that on the Preparation Day, the Passover Lamb was slain, and on that day also "Christ our Passover" was sacrificed for us. The Christian Sacrament is thus represented no longer as in any sense a continuation of the Jewish national feast, and the events which the former commemorates are seen to be not merely of national but of universal importance. Our Lord is the Saviour of the world. Also, the dogmatic interest goes deeper. Jesus is the Paschal Lamb, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world: "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." It is sometimes maintained (as by Professor Scott[2]) that this Evangelist does not really hold the Pauline doctrine of the atoning death of Christ, and that the occurrence of such ideas as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" are merely survivals of the orthodox doctrine in the Evangelist's thoughts, erratic boulders deposited by the movement towards the utterance of a Gospel more adapted to the needs of a changing world of religious thought.[3] The phrase, "the atoning death of Christ" may have been just as ambiguous

1. E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 223.
2. *op. cit.*, p. 225.
3. cf. *supra*, pp. 70 ff.

in the second century as it is in the twentieth; what we are concerned to preserve, if the death of Christ is to retain its central place in Christian faith, is not any theory of its efficacy based on Jewish sacrificial ideas, but its objectivity. It means something God has done for men they could not do for themselves: not merely an impression made on their hearts. To this Evangelist, the death of Christ is a vicarious act of love: "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son." In the impressive passage where the Evangelist comments upon the words used by Caiaphas, "It is expedient that one man should die for the people" —he is suggesting that the Cross of Christ is an occurrence deeply laden with redemptive meaning for the whole world. Moreover, the redemptive idea is clearly suggested in Chapter vi, "This is "the bread that cometh down from heaven . . . the "bread which I shall give is my flesh for the life "of the world"; and the redemptive idea is still more clearly put forward in the First Epistle, "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin." The absence of emphasis on what may be called "the atoning death of Christ" in the Gospel, and the emphasis not on what men are saved from, but rather on the kind of life to which they are saved, is no more remarkable than the Evangelist's omission of the story of the institution of the Supper. As he assumes that that story is well known to his readers, and has indeed taken its

place in the liturgical practice of the Church, so he assumes that the sacrificial idea of the death of Christ, and its objective value, has already its place in the thought of the Christian community. It only requires to be presented in such a way as to make it intelligible to a Hellenistic world.

2. Paul approaches the death of Christ from the side of man's need of righteousness: John from the side of man's need of life, moral energy. His whole conception of the death of Christ is that it is the source of life for the world. "I am come that they might have life." His death set free the Spirit of Life that was manifested to his immediate followers in the days of His flesh. "Spirit was not yet; for Jesus was not yet glorified." The Evangelist's purpose in his presentation of the earthly life is to display that Spirit as the animating principle throughout Christ's life in the flesh. He finds it impossible to describe the life on earth without shewing that it involves at every point the idea of the Cross. From the very beginning the shadow of the Cross falls on Christ's earthly life; there is not, as in the Synoptic development, any movement of events which are bringing it gradually and visibly nearer, and there is no development in the teaching of Jesus which He gave to his disciples, leading up in the end to the necessity of the Cross. The Cross is clearly foreseen and foretold from the outset of the

ministry. The Baptist points his disciples to Jesus as the Lamb of God.

There is a deep impressiveness in the conception of the "hour" which pervades the whole thought of the Gospel. "Mine hour is not yet come." That fateful hour, as we shall presently see, is conceived of as determined not by the choice of men; the will of God alone shall determine when it shall strike. Meantime attention may be directed to a twofold use which is made of the expression "the hour" or "mine hour" in the Gospel.

(1) It is conceived as the actual moment of the crucifixion. "Mine hour is not yet come" (ii, 4), are words that are spoken at the marriage at Cana by the Lord to His mother. At first sight it is not quite clear why the idea of the Cross should here be introduced, but as we ponder the context of the saying, the reference seems plainer. This miracle is represented as typical of the ministry of Jesus on earth, and the climax of that ministry was the Cross. The word "hour," in the allusive style of the Evangelist, means both the moment for doing what is suggested, and also what will be the ultimate outcome of the earthly ministry thus entered upon, the Cross. In vii, 30, we are told that "no man laid hold on him, for his hour was not yet come," and similarly in viii, 20. In xii, 23, 27, we have this Evangelist's account of the Gethsemane prayer; "Father save me from

this hour . . . but for this cause came I unto this hour." In xiii, 1, the "hour" in this sense of the crucifixion is again mentioned, and in xvi, 4, 32, the disciples are again reminded of the hour that is imminent. The High-priestly prayer begins with the words, "Father, the hour is come." (xvii, 1.) In xix, 27, it is said "From that hour the disciple took her to his own home."

(2) There is also another aspect of the hour, where it is conceived one might say, dramatically, as the moment when the life, the Spirit of Christ, is set free and becomes the life of the world. "The "hour cometh and now is when the dead shall hear "the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear "shall live" (v, 25). It is the moment when the Divine power, authority (ἐξουσία) of Christ conferred on Him by God, becomes the power of exercising judgment upon men; when all that "are in their graves" shall hear His voice, and come forth to judgment. The Cross is itself the moment of Judgment—"Now is the Prince of this world judged." At first sight, it is somewhat perplexing to find this conception of the Last Judgment appearing in the thought of the Evangelist, who at another time has said that Jesus did not come to judge the world. Occasionally the Evangelist uses judge (κρίνω) where condemn (κατακρίνω) is really meant. He is, however, writing at a time when the expectation of an immediate Day of

final judgment has grown less and is receding into the mist of the future, and it has become necessary to emphasise that men's judgment begins here and now, with the coming of the Spirit of the Risen Christ. Abbott's note may be quoted in full: "John accumulates passages to shew that the Divine judgment consists (in one sense) in *not* judging (viii, 15, "I judge no man"), but in *making the guilty judge themselves* through the conviction of the Logos within their hearts, so that the Son does really "judge," in that sense (viii, 16, "And yet *if I judge*, my judgment is true."). The Son came "not to judge," but to "save" and to bring "light." Yet the rejection of the light causes "judgment," by the laws of spiritual Nature, to fall on those who reject it.[1] The "dead who are in their graves," and "those who are in their graves," are thought of as those who are spiritually dead, of whom the man at the pool of Bethesda who had suffered his weakness for thirty-eight years, is a type.

Again in iv, 21, 23, the hour is regarded as the inauguration of that era when all barriers of nationality and creed shall be transcended, and men shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth. The hour "cometh and now is"; it is the inauguration of the new era, which is already here in the Person of Jesus. It is, therefore, the beginning as well as the promise of the new era.

1. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*, 1714 f.

The idea is paralleled in the thought of Paul, when he says that "in Christ Jesus, there is neither Jew "nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free." In his conception of the "hour," thus foreseen by Jesus during His earthly ministry, the Evangelist lays stress on the fact that the death of Christ cannot be separated from His life. We may believe also that such a conception was most important as a counteractive to the docetic ideas of Jesus' death which were becoming rife in the church of His day. If His death was thus an integral part of His consciousness, it could not be regarded as a mere appearance, an illusion on the part of men. The Cross also is part of that great world of truth, or reality which was made visible to men, in which they were enfranchised, and of which they were made free, by the coming of Christ in the flesh. The heavens are opened and remain open, and men see the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.

3. There can be little doubt that this Evangelist's presentation of the death of Jesus is governed by a strong, apologetic interest. If we recognise this fact, we shall be provided with a key, both to the comparative absence of those sacrificial and Jewish conceptions of the Cross which are prominent in the Pauline thought, and to the presence of those particular aspects of it that are prominent in this Gospel. The lines of the conventional apologetic

for the death of the Messiah in Christian thought appear in the Synoptic Gospels. In the Gospel of Matthew especially, proof is brought to bear that the death of Christ was foretold in the Jewish Scriptures, in the prophetic writings. This whole line of thinking along which not only the death, but the person of the Christ as He appeared in Jesus, was regarded as foretold in the Jewish literature, was really at heart directed towards the same end as the Fourth Evangelist has in view. It was intended to prove—often by the rabbinical and imaginative use of certain stock proof-passages—that Jesus both in His life and in His death was no unheralded phenomenon in the story of the world. The words of the Prophets and the Law were as the laws of the universe to us. Jesus, as He actually appeared on earth and as He actually died, was in the thought of God from the very beginning of His redemptive purpose for the world. Christianity, in other words, is no freak religion. The Fourth Evangelist only rarely refers to the fulfilment of prophecy in the life and death of Jesus. He has, however, accomplished what in the end is a more impressive vindication of the Cross, which was both a scandal to the Jew, and a foolishness to the Greek. He shews its place in the eternal purpose of God, by displaying in his account of the trial and the events that led up to it, and of the verdict that was passed and the motives that actuated his judges, that the sole, guilty responsibility lay upon the shoulders of

the Jewish people. That is the impression that we receive inevitably, after reading this Evangelist's account of the Trial scenes. We execrate Caiaphas and we pity Pilate; and throughout it all we are made to feel that the Divine purpose is being accomplished, and that all the actors are but its instruments, blind and unknowing. Moreover, the interpretation of the Evangelist was also intended to have its effect on the mind of the patriotic Roman, who was only too ready to regard the crucifixion of Jesus as a legitimate punishment for high treason. Pilate's verdict, and the complete breakdown of the charges of treason brought against Jesus, would both shew that it was not possible to look upon the decisive happening of Christian history as a crime against the State. Pilate would have set Christ free, had he been a free agent. The same apologetic motive is of course also prominent in Luke, who dedicates his Gospel to Theophilus, probably a young Roman nobleman who was a Christian enquirer. The Fourth Evangelist's account of the trial was also calculated to make a profound impression on the minds of those that were "of Cæsar's household."

It must further have seemed to many critics of the Christian faith that a very good case might be made out for the position that, in the Cross, the forces of evil in the world triumphed over Jesus, and that at the best He was a beautiful but

ineffectual dreamer, crushed at last by a destiny in whose fashioning He himself had no hand. The facts of history seemed to be against the main doctrine of the Pauline preaching which made of the Cross a great spiritual drama, in which the Lord did battle with the powers of evil, the principality of Satan, and triumphed over them. This Evangelist transfers the scene of this spiritual drama to the life on earth, and in his account of it the whole tendency is to shew that underneath the appearance of sheer defeat, Jesus Christ retains complete command of all the forces that are at work against Him. He suffered because He willed to suffer. From the very beginning Jesus, as Master of His own fate, believes that the hour appointed by God will come only when and where God wills it; "I am come not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." In so far as He is continually in conscious touch with the will of God, He is superior to the events which in the eyes of men seem to be coercing His actions and forcing His movements. Our thoughts of the Cross in the Fourth Gospel are made to dwell on conceptions like these: "The Son can do nothing of himself but what he seeth the Father doing," and "I lay "down my life of myself; no man taketh it from "me. I have power to lay it down and I have power "to take it again." Herein there seems to be contradiction, a strange antinomy of thought—the complete autonomy of Christ, and at the same time

His complete submission and subordination to the Father's will. The contradiction is, as it were, resolved for the religious, if not for the philosophical, mind in the words, "I have power to lay it down, "and I have power to take it again. This "commandment have I received of my Father. "I and the Father are one." Moreover, the freedom which Jesus is represented as exercising in regard to His sufferings and death is a governing idea in the whole narrative of the arrest; His captors fall to the ground at His voice; He does not allow Himself to be taken, but gives Himself up of His own free-will; even the treacherous purpose of Judas is represented as under the control of Jesus, "That thou doest, do quickly."[1] It is quite evident that the dramatic imagination of the writer is here at work on the historical material, as elsewhere in the Gospel, and that this governing idea of the overruling will and providence of God, realised in the autonomy of Jesus, is thus dramatically extended to individual incidents of the arrest and trial.

At the same time, this conception of Jesus' subordination to the Father's will on the one hand, and of His autonomy on the other, are both in accordance with the consciousness of Jesus as delineated or suggested in the Synoptic account. The forms in which the conceptions are expressed,

1. cf. Wrede, *Charakter und Tendenz des Johannesevangeliums*, pp. 51 ff.

and the method of application of them to definite situations may be due to the Evangelist, but the ideas are Christ's. "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father" is a direct statement of autonomy, and in Jesus' reply to the messengers who warned Him that He was in danger of His life at the hands of Herod, He states that He will not be turned aside from either His purpose or His journey, because of the possible danger. "Go "ye, and tell that fox, behold, I cast out devils, and "accomplish cures to-day and to-morrow, and on "the third day I finish my work. But to-day, and "to-morrow and the next day, I must journey on." (Luke xiii, 31 ff). There is indeed deep irony in the words that follow: "It cannot be that a prophet should perish out of Jerusalem;" but underlying them, there is also the conviction that in Jerusalem, by a judicial act of the people, Jesus will lay down His life. He will not perish secretly by the assassin's hand. What is this but the Johannine idea, "I lay down my life of myself; no man taketh it from me?" In the story of the centurion also, Jesus is deeply moved by the utterance of a man who, though not of the chosen nation, can yet share with Himself the faith that the whole power of the universe is at His disposal; "so great faith," for this power at His disposal is, like the centurion's, delegated—in His instance, from God. There is the same conception in the utterance about the twelve legions of angels in

Matt. xxvi, 53.[1] There are several passages in the Synoptic Gospels where it is clearly expressed that the "Son of Man must suffer," and that His ultimate fate is in God's hands; and there are several occasions on which Our Lord refuses to anticipate danger needlessly and recklessly. One of the most impressive of these describes the precautions which He took, in order that the Last Supper might take place undisturbed, and that His enemies might have no previous knowledge of His whereabouts in Jerusalem at the moment. Luke (xxii, 16) also speaks of the moment when Jesus sat down at the Table with His disciples at the "hour," and here also is the conception that the hour is determined by the Father. To use words that are applied to the Second Advent in Matthew (xxiv, 36): "Of that day and hour "knoweth no man, not the angels in heaven, but "my Father only." It may be said that "the Logos idea penetrates the actual reminiscence of the life of Christ," which is true; yet the Fourth

1. There is the same element of temptation in these words, as we find so frequently in the Fourth Gospel, in the attitude of Jesus as to the use of the divine resources at His command. "He looked at His ragged regiment of twelve men, comprising perhaps eleven runaways and one traitor . . . and He would replace each man by a legion. How quickly the kingdom of God would come! How the kings of the earth would shut their mouths at Him! . . . But that was an old temptation, out of which the fire had gone long ago. How could the Empire of Love be founded on the Empire of Force? So He silenced a rising prayer, and did not call for His natural reinforcements. 'Put up now thy sword into its sheath, Peter, for I have refused to draw My sword out of its own sheath, and Mine is far mightier than thine.'" (Rendel Harris, *As Pants the Hart*, p. 25).

Evangelist has not moved in essentials outside the historical interpretation of the mind of Jesus regarding His relationship to the Father. And, it may be repeated, to the religious mind, there is no psychological confusion at all, and no real conflict between the autonomy of Jesus and His subordination to the will of the Father.

In the idea of the Cross, therefore, in the Fourth Gospel, there are contained these two conceptions, the "hour," and the insistence on the truth that the death of Jesus is a real event. The latter is simply part of that apologetic insistence throughout the Gospel, in opposition to docetic ideas, on the reality of the human life of Jesus, and on the fact that he truly suffered. The necessity under which the Christian Church was laid of proclaiming the reality of the Cross, first as an integral element in the life of Christ, and secondly as a life that was a human life, sensitive to pain and subject to death,—was really occasioned by the presence of a certain, more or less unconscious, Stoical element in the mental attitude of men towards all pain and suffering. On this we have already touched. However impossible men found it to carry out the complete Stoical conception of "apathy" towards the evils of life, they at least demanded in the ideal character, in the "hero"—much more in the founder of a religion, whose character was held up before them, not only for imitation, but for worship as a Divine being,—complete moral control of the

outward circumstances of life. In this Gospel, the true spirit of the missionary preacher, endeavouring to gain a real point of contact with contemporary ideals of life, is apparent. The missionary preacher was confronted with a general attitude of mind which would render any conception of a god who suffered pain and shame, and really felt these things, not only incredible, but repulsive. "παθητός" (subject to suffering) was a word that waked rage "and contempt in everyone," says Dr. Glover,—everyone who not only thought of God as remote from the ordinary life of men, but accepted however unconsciously, Stoic conceptions of greatness and of ideal human character.[1] It was difficult for men imbued with Greek ways of thinking to believe that one who was worshipped as a Divine being should have allowed Himself to be betrayed by one of His own intimate friends. That the treachery of Judas was a real weapon in the hands of the enemies of Christianity is shewn by the prominence given to this character in the Gospel, and by such statements as imply that Jesus "knew from the beginning who should betray Him." It was as though the Commander-in-Chief of a great army had been discovered to have an enemy traitor on his General Staff, and did not know it. It must also have been a serious difficulty to many minds, that Jesus not only allowed Himself to be subjected to infamous and shameful treatment, but felt it

1. T. R. Glover, *The Conflict of Religions*, p. 155.

acutely, and shrank from it; indeed prayed that the shame and pain might pass from Him. It was well-nigh impossible for a Greek mind to conceive that a Divine Being should weep at the grave of a friend, or thirst, or agonise as in Gethsemane. Gethsemane would appear a moral breakdown, unworthy of Him, and of what He professed to be,—the perfect revelation of God, and the highest ideal of human character.[1] It meant a complete reversal of contemporary habits of thought when a Greek was asked to worship as a Divine Saviour a man on a cross, the emblem of a shameful end, who suffered thereon agonies of mind and body. To such a mind, the claim made that Jesus was God manifest in the flesh, seemed indeed "foolishness."

In this connexion, it is relevant to say a word regarding the general conception of the self-possession of Jesus—so marked a feature of the portrait in the Fourth Gospel—in so far as it has a bearing upon the Stoic attitude towards suffering and death. We have seen how this Evangelist represents Jesus as Himself governing and directing the circumstances that ultimately led to the death on the Cross. The Stoic would find it hard to understand why this self-possession, if it really existed in Jesus, was not applied to the reaction in His soul against the wrongs that He suffered and

1. cf. M. Aurelius, Med. XI, 18, "As grief is a weakness, so also is anger. In both it is a case of a wound and a surrender." (Trans. Haines.)

the pains that He endured. No doubt these were endured for others, and the Stoic insisted that the ideal man lived not for himself alone, but was intended to devote himself to the service of society as a whole, and even on occasion to sacrifice his life for his friend, or for his city, or for mankind. The Stoic does not deny that it may be "according to nature," according to the ideal plan of life that a man should, in the interest of others or of his country, suffer pain and hardship, and even death. It would be possible to collect several passages from Stoic writers to shew that the Stoic believed in altruism, and even in laying down one's life for others. "If you consider yourself as a man "and as a part of a certain whole, for the sake of "that whole it may now become you to be sick, at "another time to sail the seas and to run into danger, "at another time to be in want, and perchance to "die before your time."[1] Why, then, should the Stoic find fault with the character of Jesus because He devoted Himself to death for the sake of humanity?

The answer may best be given in the following passage, where the contrast with the Christian ideal of service is stated in words of remarkable beauty and precision:

"The Wise Man (i.e., the Ideal Character) is not "to concern himself with his brethren—that is the point

1. Epictetus, *Diss.*, II, V, §4. I have made free use of Professor W. L. Davidson's translation of this passage in *The Stoic Creed* (p 163), and of his comments.

" —he was only to serve them. Benevolence he was to " have, as much of it as you can conceive ; but there was " one thing he must not have, and that was love. Here, " too, if that inner tranquillity and freedom of his was to " be kept safe through everything—here, too, as when he " was intending to acquire objects for himself, he must " engage in action without desire. He must do everything " which it is possible for him to do, shrink from no extreme " of physical pain, in order to help, to comfort, to guide " his fellow-men, but whether he succeeds or not must be " a matter of pure indifference to him. If he has done his " best to help you and failed, he will be perfectly satisfied " with having done his best. The fact that you are no " better off for his exertions will not matter to him at " all. Pity in the sense of a painful emotion caused by " the sight of other men's suffering is actually a vice. " The most that can be allowed when a wise man goes " to console a mourner, is that he should feign sympathy " as a means of attaining his object, but he must take care " not to feel it. He may sigh, as Epictetus says, pro- " vided the sigh does not come from his heart. In the " service of his fellow-men he must be prepared to " sacrifice his health, to sacrifice his possessions, to " sacrifice his life ; but there is one thing he must never " sacrifice, his own eternal calm."[1]

Also, the ideal Stoic " wise man " is nobly described by Horace in the well-known lines :

> Sapiens, sibi qui imperiosus,
> Quem neque pauperies neque mors neque vincula terrent,
> Responsare cupidinibus, contemnere honores
> Fortis, et id se ipso totus, teres atque rotundus,
> Externi nequid valeat per leve morari,
> In quem manca ruit semper fortuna.[2]

Marcus Aurelius[3] compares the mind of the ideal Stoic to a " sphere," ever true to its own centre (αὐτοειδής), neither expanding nor contracting. With this we may compare Horace's *totus, teres*

1. E. Bevan, *Stoics and Sceptics*, pp. 66 f.
2. *Satires*, II, vii, 83 ff
3. *Med.*, XI, 12.

atque rotundus. In another passage in the *Meditations*[1] Aurelius does make a kind of concession to the inevitableness of pity. Epictetus is more rigid, at least when he deals with the ideal characters of old. "Ulysses sat crying on a "rock . . . if Ulysses really did cry, what was he "but a wretched man?"[2] Yet, the natural love of parent for child once at least penetrates his guard. He seems to have been himself childless and unmarried, but says, "He (the wise man) knows "that if once a child is born, it will not be in our "power not to love it nor care for it."[3] It was precisely the persistent assertion—hinted at in Epictetus' words—by human nature, of its own primary instincts and affections, that slew Stoicism and welcomed Christianity, with its central doctrine of the "Word made flesh." Christianity refused to look upon the bodily life as an evil. Jesus came that we "may have life, and may "have it to the full."

"There is one thing he must never sacrifice, his "own tranquillity, his own eternal calm." Matthew Arnold, in a passage towards the end of his essay on Marcus Aurelius, says that the philosopher would have found in this Fourth Gospel what "might have looked too like what he knew already to be a total surprise to him." One wonders whether he would not have been surprised—he who

1. II, 13.
2. *Discourses*, III, 24.
3. *ib.* I, 23, cf. T. R. Glover, *Conflict of Religions*, p. 51.

was ever stretching out his arms for something beyond—had he ever read that passage in the Fourth Gospel where the Risen Lord confers on His disciples a gift of peace, and triumphantly shews them His hands and His side, with the marks upon them of the wounds that had cost Him such agony? "My peace I leave with you; my peace "I give unto you. Not as the world giveth, give I "unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither "let it be afraid." The Christian εἰρήνη supplanted the Stoic απαθία and the Epicurean ἀταραξία; by his portrait of Jesus, the Fourth Evangelist has shewn that he believed it to be so, and that the ideal human character, the perfect man, was God Himself manifest in the flesh. It is true that in this Gospel there is at times a certain aloofness, a power of self-determination, a certain almost Olympian stature in the Christ whom he depicts; yet these do not detract from but rather enhance, the Evangelist's insistence upon the real moral struggle, the real element of temptation which Jesus experienced in His earthly journey towards the Cross, which was also His throne. The Christ of the Fourth Gospel takes a common word used very casually by men when they met one another, and lifts it up into a region of meaning far above either common usage or even the Stoic calm. Christ's "peace" is the fruit of a victory, accomplished not by the mind, but by that very subjection to suffering which the Stoic taught men—in vain—to

depreciate; His peace is greater than Stoic tranquillity—eternal and inexhaustible.

Three times in this Gospel does the writer speak of Christ as being "troubled," and twice does he repeat the saying of Our Lord to His disciples, "Let not your heart be troubled." The word used is ταράσσω and it can scarcely be without deliberate significance that the Evangelist makes use of an expression which must have been familiar at least to all educated Greeks at the beginning of the second century. ἀταραξία or "freedom from trouble," undisturbed tranquillity, was the supreme characteristic of the "wise man," the type of human spiritual attainment which attracted the thought of all who were concerned with the spiritual life. In his *Encheiridion*, or "Manual" of the spiritual life, Epictetus says:

"Men are disturbed (troubled), not by things but by "the principles and notions which they form concerning "things. Death, for instance, is not terrible, else it "would have appeared so to Socrates. But the terror "consists in our notion of death that it is terrible. When, "therefore, thwarted, or troubled, or grieved, let us never "impute it to others, but to ourselves; that is, to our "own principles. It is the action of an uninstructed "person to lay the fault of his own bad condition upon "others; of one entering upon instruction to lay the "fault on himself; and of one perfectly instructed, "neither on others nor on himself."[1]

Three times in the Gospel is emphasis laid on the fact that Jesus was "troubled." Once He is said

1. *Encheiridion*, 5 (Trans. Carter.)

to be "troubled in soul" (xii, 27), once "troubled in spirit" (xiii, 21); and once in a curious phrase He is said to "trouble Himself" (ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν xi, 33), where probably we may see a somewhat clumsy attempt to express in two words the Evangelist's conception of Jesus' attitude to "trouble," and to combine the ideas of Stoical "self-determination" and of sensitiveness to human sorrow.[1] Three times in the Lazarus story it is related that Jesus "loved" the family at Bethany (xi, 3, 5, 36); in the last instance this love is assigned by the mourners as the cause of the weeping. The Stoic taught that a man must serve his fellows in a spirit of benevolence, but he dare not "love" them. Marcus Aurelius would surely, in spite of Matthew Arnold, have encountered a "total surprise," had he ever read the opening words of the thirteenth chapter, where most impressively all that could trouble the soul of Jesus at the moment is massed together, in an unwonted, periodic style; where in the midst of it all, it is said that "having loved His own He loved them unto the uttermost." Nay, more, the expression of that love is found in an act of the lowliest service, while all the time He is carrying the sin and the pride of men, and the shrinking from death, in His heart.

The Stoic naturally shrank from keeping open those channels of love and pity, those delicate

1. cf. Abbott, *The Fourfold Gospel*, p. 153; but cf. M. Dods, *Expositor's Greek Testament, ad. loc.*

fibres of emotion which absorb the waters of the world's pain and unrest into a sensitive heart :

> Desperate tides of the whole world's anguish,
> Forced through the channels of a single heart.

The Stoic believed that by opening these channels, there was admitted a cause of disturbance which it was without man's power to control ; yet here, in this Gospel, more especially in the picture of the Suffering Christ, not only is there manifested complete control, but there is radiated a peace which the world can neither give nor take away ! Mr. Bevan's words are fully justified : " Gethsemane, " looked at from his [the Stoic's] point of view, " was a signal breakdown. The Christian's Ideal " Figure could never be accepted by the Stoic " as an example of his typical Wise Man." [1]

Jesus speaks both in Chapter xi and in the Farewell Discourses, as Lord and as Victor ; yet the tones are the tones of one who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities. His " groaning " did come from within. The purpose of the Evangelist is evidently to commend the portrait of Jesus, not only to those who were influenced by the Stoic conception, but also to those who found it vain to suppress the spontaneous outburst of human emotion and passion. The cultured Stoic sought to subdue these fountains of inward disturbance by walling them over ; the ordinary man found them, as he will always do, welling up in his heart, and

1. E. Bevan, *Stoics and Sceptics*, p. 70.

having drunk of them, he thirsted still. Jesus had emotions and passions like our own, but also a deep, inward peace, which it was in His power to convey, as His last, abiding legacy to men. Jesus recognised what the Stoic had failed to recognise, the need for satisfying the deepest instincts of the human heart, and the deep need for deliverance from spiritual disturbance and fear. Truth or Reality, in other words "Nature," as conceived by the Christian, does not exclude the facts of pain, sin, and death. These are the enemies of human life, but in the life and death of Jesus they are vanquished enemies. They that are of the Truth have heard His voice and have entered into the liberty of the sons of God. They know the Truth, and the Truth has made them free.[1]

In this Gospel there is a marvellous blending in its portrait of Jesus, of Divine majesty and actual experience of human weakness. There is a moving tenderness and pity which breathes all through the closing discourses in Chapters xiv–xvi. At the same time, in none of the Gospels is it made so plain that Jesus, in the conduct of His life and in the carrying out of the vocation which culminated in the Cross, is not guided ultimately even by the noblest and most compelling motives of human compassion and human affection. This will be more

1. I have made use here of some sentences from my book, "*The Fourth Gospel: its Significance and Environment*," where the whole question of the Stoic reference in the Gospel is more fully developed. (*Introduction*, pp. 28 ff.)

clearly seen in three passages, to which special attention may now be directed; ii, 4, vii, 1-10, xi, 1-16.

1. ii, 4. "Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come." The miracle at Cana of Galilee is regarded as the inaugural act of His public ministry, and as such it is a first step towards the Cross. It is clearly foreseen in this Gospel that the first wave of popularity would pass, and that in the end hatred would triumph. The allusive manner of this Evangelist, and his poetic mind, encourage us to think that the mention of the "wine" is intended to direct our thoughts to the story of the Great Sacrifice.

In the Synoptic Gospels, Our Lord ponders in the solitude of a wilderness, the use that He is called upon to make of the miraculous powers bestowed upon Him, and of which He has become conscious. In solitude He repels the sinister suggestions of the Tempter to use these powers for the purpose of outwardly impressing the nation, and realising the current conceptions and expectations of the Messiah. In repelling these temptations, He is conscious that He is choosing the way of the Cross, and it is remarkable that when the temptation to renounce the Cross assails Him in the person of one of His own intimate friends, He meets it with a vehemence and a sternness that shews its strength. "Get thee behind me, Satan!" These three incidents which have been singled out from the story of the Fourth Gospel are all, in one aspect of them,

temptations. His mother tempts Him when she suggests the use of His miraculous powers for the purpose of gladdening a marriage feast; His brethren tempt Him when they urge Him to go up to the feast at Jerusalem to display His powers before the populace; it is also a temptation, as we shall see, when the summons comes to Him from the stricken family at Nazareth. The Jesus of the Fourth Evangelist is not a figure entirely aloof from humanity; at all events, the scenes of His temptations are found amid the ordinary haunts of humanity, and His tempters are human beings. Not in the wilderness, but at a marriage-feast, within His own family circle, from the home at Bethany, does the temptation come to hasten, in response to human suggestion, by rashly courting danger, the hour which God has appointed. Historically, this may well have been so, and a considerable part of Our Lord's temptations may well have arisen from affectionate intercourse and interchange of thought between Himself and His mother. There are two kinds of temptation, the glittering kind that allures, and the more authoritative and subtle kind, which exerts its pressure in proportion to the character of the source from which it springs. The temptations of Jesus in this Gospel are all of the latter kind. They all spring from those who were attached to Him by ties of love and friendship.

In the request of the mother of Jesus and her

silent appeal to His resources, "they have no wine," we have a picture of her natural recourse to her Son's miraculous power, in whose heart the ordinary anxieties and cares of men found a sympathetic place. The teaching of the Evangelist in recording Our Lord's reply seems to be that not even the claims or persuasions of human affection, nor the ordinary daily needs of men, must be allowed to shape His action in the conduct of His ministry, least of all in its inaugural act. Only when His mother has tacitly recognised His independence of her suggestion, in the command to the servants, "Whatsoever He saith unto you, do it," does He give the help that is requested. For Jesus, in this act of ministry, a new era is dawning, and in the end the reward of His gracious ministry to the life of men will be the Cross. That is why the "hour" is mentioned in this connection at all, "Mine hour is not yet come." Even in response to human need, and the call of human affection, such a step can only be taken if He can clearly recognise the will of the Father. Only on the call of the Father can He employ His miraculous power. "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do."

2. vii, 1–14.[1] In this passage the brethren of

1. Verse 10 is to be ascribed to the Editor. cf. pp. 110 ff. of the present work. In the words "not openly but secretly," an explanation of the delay is given which ignores the real significance of His hesitation. There is no appearance of secrecy in verses 25 ff. Verses 15–24 are displaced, and ought to stand after x, 47.

Jesus are represented as urging Him to enter upon a public manifestation at Jerusalem in order that "thy disciples may behold the works that thou doest." In His reply, Jesus uses the word καιρός instead of ὥρα, and the word occurs nowhere else in the Gospel. It is used in Matthew xxvi, 18, in a sense identical with the Johannine. Its use in this passage is probably dictated by the fact that ὥρα is not suitable as applied to the suggestion of the brethren, as the word is dedicated all through the Gospel to the sense of the divinely appointed hour of the Cross. Also, there is intended an ironical contrast between the hour appointed by God, and the moment that appears suitable to the family of Jesus. "Go ye up unto the feast; I go "not up[1] unto the feast, because my time has not "yet arrived."

We are told that "Jesus remained in Galilee," and subsequently in verse 14 that He makes His appearance at the feast. We have here the same kind of apparently abrupt contradiction as in the words "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" It is out of the question to interpret Jesus' conduct as meaning that He intended to do what was asked all the time. What has happened can only mean that in the interval, the will of God has been made plain to Him. The "time" for His brethren to act

1. The reading οὐκ for οὔπω is strongly supported, and there is evidence that both Porphyry and Chrysostom comment on the passage, without any knowledge of the reading οὔπω. cf. p. 112.

is determined by their own unaided judgment. It is open to them, and as they think to Jesus also, to go up to the feast, whenever the appointed season comes round. Outward events do not alone determine the action of Jesus. He is fulfilling a higher calling, and must on all occasions, where events seem to urge Him to enter the capital city, wait until God the Father has declared His will. In the interval of waiting, the Divine will has been made known to Him.

3. xi. 1-16. The delay in the Lazarus story is dealt with elsewhere, There seems to be no reason to solve the difficulty created by the "therefore" which closely connects verses 5 and 6, by transferring verse 5 to a place between verses 2 and 3.[1] Nowhere in the Gospel is the human dependence of Jesus more prominent than in the Lazarus story. At first He says that the sickness of Lazarus is "not unto death." It is to be the occasion of His going to Bethany, and will ultimately lead to His dying or being "glorified." Then comes the delay. Afterwards, on the way, as though He had received the news by a divine insight, He tells the disciples that Lazarus is dead. The whole picture of Jesus in the Lazarus story is of One who is not the mere powerless victim of outward circumstances, but moves among these as one guided consciously by the Light from God. He "walks in the day,"

1. As Professor Moffatt does in his *New Translation*; cf. *supra*, p. 227.

and upon the outward events that seem to be urging Him inevitably to the Cross, there shines at every moment the light of the will of God. "If "a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because "the light is not in him" (verse 10). The whole narrative (1–16) is a tender, realistic, and very human picture of One whose steps each day are directed, not even by His noblest human instincts nor by His affection for Lazarus, but by a Light that belongs to a higher world, One whose communion with God is simple and childlike. Although He is in perfect accord with the will of God at all times, that will is revealed to Him from hour to hour, as guidance is required.[1] The revelation of the Father in Jesus Christ is determined by no merely metaphysical relationship, but by oneness of will. For the first time in history, a human heart reflected

1. The interpretation given above is largely an expansion of these words taken from Zahn, *Das Evangelium Johannis*, (pp. 374-5):

"Our Evangelist depicts Jesus from beginning to end, frankly "as a scholar who is learning all the time in relation to His life's "calling; as the Servant who waits upon the sign of the will of "God, and as the Son who seeks the knowledge of his Father's "will in prayer. He finds nothing to disconcert in the fact that "Jesus altered His purposes and resolutions regarding His in- "dividual action in accordance with a gradual instruction and "direction received from above. Such an alteration takes place "in a few moments in ii, 3-8. In vii, 1-14 there are days of "waiting, on whose expiry Jesus does what formerly He had "refused to do. Essentially, it is not otherwise with the two "days of distant waiting in xi, 6. It is out of place to say that "Jesus was in error in any of these instances. We can only say "that He did not yet know at the first what God meant Him to "do. At the proper moment this ignorance gives place to the "requisite knowledge . . . What failed Him when He so spoke "was the certainty as to what He ought to do in spite of such "knowledge as He had. Without such certainty, He must and "would do nothing."

the Divine Purpose and the Divine Nature without a shadow of hesitation or a ripple on the calm surface of its faith. The Death on the Cross was the climax of that Divine purpose, which it set free in the gift of the Spirit for the whole world. The day and the hour were known to God alone.

The Lazarus story is used as a dramatic introduction to the story of the death of Jesus, in which He appears as Lord of Life and of Death. In the subsequent narrative, Jesus' death is apparently determined by the ecclesiastical authorities, and decreed by Caiaphas; but even Caiaphas "spake not of himself," uncontrolled by the will of God. The Coming of the Greeks is a signal that the appointed hour for the whole world is near, when Jesus shall be "glorified." The traitor acts with Christ's permission,—"That thou doest, do quickly." Pilate also has no authority over Him, except as given "from above."[1]

I have already spoken[2] of the way in which the events of the trial are so presented as to emphasise the Divine Purpose which over-ruled them all. There is yet one incident in the closing days which, to my mind, is the most significant of all. The most striking use is made in the Gospel of the story of the Anointing. Mary of Bethany is represented as the one who alone really understood, shared with Our Lord the true understanding, of the meaning of

1. cf. pp. 20 f.
2. pp. 18 ff.

His death. The Fourth Evangelist inserts the story of the Anointing of Jesus in the same order and context as we find it in the Synoptic Gospels. As in the case of the two miracles of the Miraculous Meal and the Walking on the Water in Chapter vi, where the Synoptic order is also followed, so here we may suppose that the Evangelist retains that order, not merely for the purpose of retelling the story (it is true with certain alterations in detail), but in order to emphasise some symbolic meaning which it serves. It may be conjectured that one particular point which the Evangelist seeks to make is contained in xii, 7,[1] "Suffer her to keep it until the day of my burying." It is implied that a portion of the perfume which has pervaded the whole house—another distinctive Johannine touch —is kept for the last offices to His dead body by permission of the Lord Himself. This forward reference to Jesus' death is an indication that it was already in Mary's mind, and that she regarded it as an act which evoked her adoration. The form of Jesus' words in answer to Judas' vulgar criticism implies that He knew what was in her mind. The feast the friends had prepared for Him was little suited as consolation to a breaking heart, blunderingly intended as it was to do Him honour. Jesus accepts homage only from those who understand, and whose hearts are at one with His own.

1. The reading Ἄφες αὐτήν, ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τηρήσῃ αὐτό, is probably correct. The reading τετήρηκεν, with the omission of ἵνα, is Syrian.

The costly offering which Mary squandered upon Him—so Judas thought—was a rich symbol of the extravagant profusion of His own dying love. The Evangelist emphasises Jesus' knowledge of what Mary meant to say in the form given to the words, "Suffer her to keep it until the day of my burying." Her act had the Divine permission and approval. She, and she alone, of all who surrounded Him during these last days, understood; the others were blind. Hers was the one glance of recognition which shewed that she was aware of the meaning of the act; Jesus and Mary saw into one another's hearts. Her love—like His own—recognised that the truth could not be told by telling, and expressed it in a deathless symbol. Thus the Evangelist would say that none of the disciples, save only Mary of Bethany, realised before the crucifixion the inward meaning of the death He was about to die; that Calvary was not the defeat, but the triumph of Love.

CHAPTER X

The Story of The Resurrection

I. The Visit to the Empty Tomb (xx, 2–10).

Certain general grounds may be brought forward in support of the position that this passage does not belong to the original Gospel. The reasons about to be given are based partly on Wellhausen's arguments,[1] and partly on literary grounds. In general it may be urged that the passage is an interruption of the dramatic unity of the scene where the Lord reveals Himself to Mary in the garden. This scene is one of the most thrilling in the whole Gospel. Its haunting pathos, and the sudden passage from despair to joyous faith, has won for it an assured place among the classical records of the deepest Christian experience. Nowhere else in the Gospel is it so plain that the writer is above all else a glowing preacher and only incidentally a historian. The passage is to be ranked among the two or three great dramatic descriptions of religious experience in all literature. The seeking love of Christ is concentrated in a single word, " Mary ! " ; her rapture of astonishment, her awe and devotion, are suggested with magnificent restraint in the single word " Rabboni."

1. *Das Evangelium Johannis*, pp. 97 ff.

Even her action in clasping His feet is not described, but is left to be inferred from the words which follow. All accidental details are omitted. The religious passion and romance are not splashed on the narrative by the writer, but are inevitably revealed in the story he has to tell. He has, as it were, caught fire from his own story.

All this presents a remarkable contrast with the style and tone of the passage describing the visit of the two disciples to the empty grave, verses 2–10. The story seems incongruous with the rest of the scene, the pathos of which it rudely interrupts. Why should the Evangelist, if this scene be from his pen, so suddenly become interested in a race between two apostles, and be so meticulously careful to describe what they saw in the grave as they looked in and the effect on each of them, immediately after having introduced such a sensitive and animated figure as the grief-stricken Mary, in whom he himself, as the subsequent narrative shews, is so absorbingly interested.

The similarity between verses 2–10 and Luke xxiv, 12, suggests that either the former passage is an expansion of the latter, or that both writers have had access to a common tradition. The question whether the Lucan passage is an integral part of the Third Gospel does not really affect the relationship between the two passages. In both the word "glanced in" (παρακύπτω)[1] is used. In the

1. cf. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*, 1798–1804.

Fourth Gospel, however, the word is applied to the "other disciple," and not to Peter. Also the word used for "linen cloths" (ὀθόνια) is the same in both, and is a word peculiar to the two Gospels. In Luke it is not used elsewhere. The Beloved Disciple is said to "see" the linen cloths; Peter in verse 6 is said to "behold" them. The second word (θεωρέω) might be translated "gazed at them," as though to Peter is due the discovery that there is something remarkable in their appearance. They are "lying," and the napkin that bound the head is "lying by itself." We must note the careful attention to words that is shewn in verse 7 as the sight is described. The suggestion seems to be that the grave-clothes still preserved the shape of the body, although the body had disappeared. It is as though the writer would lay emphasis on the fact that the actual body that was laid in the tomb had risen. This fashion of thought is akin to the materialism of the conception in Luke xxiv, 39–43, and its full significance we shall presently see. Afterwards the writer adds that "the other disciple" entered the tomb, and, seeing what Peter saw but what he himself had not at the first glance fully noticed, he also believed. "The other disciple" sees through the eyes of Peter, and both are convinced that the actual body of flesh and blood is no longer in the tomb. Verse 9, however, suggests that by what they saw, neither disciple was convinced of the full truth of the resurrection. In what mood do

the disciples " go away to their own homes," leaving their companion in such distress? Probably they are in the vacillating and undecided mood described in Luke xxiv, 12, "wondering what had happened," and in verse 24, " And certain of them that were " with us went to the tomb, and found it even so as " the women had said: but him they saw not." That the two disciples are not fully convinced, is also more fully illustrated by Luke xxiv, 25, " O foolish men and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." It is indeed possible that the insertion of the tradition contained in verses 2–10 is suggested to R by the Lucan account.

The somewhat coldly logical, and carefully detailed presentation of this scene, therefore, is in striking contrast to the restrained, allusive, and impressive emotional effect produced on the mind by the subsequent story of the appearance of the Risen Jesus to Mary. In verse 11, Mary is still standing where the narrative in verse 1 had left her, and if verses 2–10 are an integral part of the chapter, it is difficult to conceive how she comes to be there again so quickly. With her distress the preceding story seems artistically and psychologically out of keeping, as also the statement that the disciples " went away again to their own homes." It seems impossible to believe that a writer, who in the opening verse introduces Mary Magdalene as coming to the grave " while it was yet dark "—a dramatic touch that has as much symbolic

significance as the " it was night " of xiii, 30— is likely to forsake thus speedily so distressful a figure shrouded in darkness, for a description of a race between Peter and another disciple for first arrival at the tomb. The suggestion of the race between the two disciples can only be connected with an attempt to prove a certain superiority of the Petrine, i.e., the Synoptic tradition over the Johannine. Moreover, the meticulous argument of verses 2–10 is reminiscent of a similar passage, also to be ascribed to R—vi, 22 ff. For the searching investigation of the grave a good light would be required, and the darkness must have given place to dawn; yet the affecting story of verses 14ff requires for its atmosphere a still imperfect light. Jesus is dimly seen and can be mistaken for the gardener, and Mary's tearful eyes are not sufficient to account for the mistake. And there are other indications of separate authorship for the passage. Mary sees in the tomb as she, too, stoops down and glances in, a very different sight from that which was seen by the two disciples. Mary's words in verse 2 are premature, " they have taken away the Lord out of the tomb " ; for she is represented as looking in only in verse 11. Moreover, Mary's words in verse 13 are repeated in verse 2 with one very significant alteration. The plural " we know not " is used in the latter verse, which can only mean that R is thinking of the Synoptic story, where several women are present.

There are several suggestions that present themselves when we attempt to examine more deeply into the purpose which R may have had in view, when he inserted this passage. In the first place, I think it is clear that he is concerned to establish, if not the priority of the Petrine tradition of the Resurrection, at least its concurrence with the Johannine. Apart from this passage, and the Appendix of Chapter xxi, there is no further mention of Peter immediately after his denial. We may also conjecture that R regards it as unsatisfactory that, according to the Johannine story before him, the first news of the Resurrection, the news of the Empty Grave and of the Ascension, should be communicated solely through Mary, a woman, to the assembled disciples (verse 17). He seeks to make the Magdalene share the priority with Peter.[1]

A further question, however, of great importance emerges. What is the significance in these verses of the insistence on the fact, vouched for by both disciples, that Christ's actual body of flesh and blood has disappeared from the grave? The whole passage is written with an apologetic intention, and is intended to make assurance doubly sure as against the docetic interpretation of the Resurrection

1. Mark xvi, 9, although it does not belong to the original Gospel, is at least another indication, along with Jn. xx, 11 ff. of the existence of a tradition that the first appearance was to Mary Magdalene. 1 Cor. xv, 5, speaks of the first appearance as being to Peter. Paul makes no mention of any appearances to women.

of Jesus. It is apparently inserted from a conviction on the part of the Editor that the Empty Grave ought to have more prominence given to it in the Johannine narrative, as an argument for the reality of Our Lord's resurrection body. In contrast with this, what is the general attitude of the Johannine narrative towards the story of the Empty Grave? As we shall see later, there is no reason to think that the Johannine writer hints at disbelief in the story, but in comparison with verses 2–10 his account tends to minimise—no doubt unconsciously—the value of the empty tomb as a necessary element of Christian faith. Mary "beholds" in the tomb a vision of angels, but the writer's intention is to suggest that not even that sight was sufficient to re-establish her faith. Her plaint, "they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him," remains unanswered, and her pathetic request later that the body should be given into her woman's hands, would indicate the lower regions of sense in which her thoughts were moving. "If thou hast borne him thence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will remove him"—as if her woman's strength were equal to the burden! Surely it is a somewhat sinister suggestion—twice repeated in the Johannine story—that human hands had removed the body from the grave, as human hands had laid Him there, almost as if it were only a temporary resting-place, chosen because

it was near! (xix, 42). The Johannine narrative might well seem to R to open the door to the entrance of a somewhat disconcerting supposition, and to play into the hands of the authorities who were said, in the Synoptic tradition, to have spread the report that the disciples had stolen the body by night (Matt. xxviii, 13). R labours the point that both Peter and John saw clearly that no human hands had left the grave as they saw it. Those who remove a corpse take grave-clothes also, and could not have left them behind, still retaining the shape and position the body had given them. The censure implied in verse 9 is all the more severe if it is implied that notwithstanding the inescapable facts before them, the disciples did not immediately deduce their full religious significance that, according to prophecy, no phantom Christ, but a real Christ of flesh and blood had escaped from death. Perhaps, some such proof-text as " Thou wilt not suffer thine holy one to see corruption " may also have been in the writer's mind.

In addition to all this, it may be noted as a possible criticism in R's mind of the Johannine narrative, not only that admittedly, the Risen Jesus was dimly seen, and was mistaken by Mary for the gardener, but also that He makes Himself known by a voice—a very real objection to a mind so sturdily anti-docetic as that of the Editor of the Gospel. One characteristic of the appearances

of Jesus in a docetic work like *The Acts of John* is the variety of forms in which He appeared to the eyes of His disciples. The writer, referring to the call of the disciples, says that Jesus "cometh unto "me and James my brother, saying: I have need "of you, come unto me. And my brother hearing "that, said: John, what would this child have "that is upon the seashore and called us? And I "said, What child? And he said to me again, "That which beckoneth to us. And I answered: "Because of our long watch we have kept at sea, "thou seest not aright, my brother, James; but "seest thou not the man that standeth there, "comely and fair, and of a cheerful countenance? "But he said unto me: Him I see not, brother."[1] In another place the writer says "Sometimes when "I would lay hold on him, I met with a material "and solid body, and at other times when I felt "him, the substance was immaterial and as if it "existed not at all."[2] Again, in a description of the crucifixion, it is told how John sat on the Mount of Olives, whither he had fled, and is joined by Jesus Himself who says, "John, unto the "multitude below in Jerusalem, I am being crucified "and pierced with lances and reeds, and gall and "vinegar is given me to drink. But unto thee I "speak, and when I speak, hear thou." In a subsequent vision on the same spot he saw the

1. *Acts of John*, 88 (Trans. M. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*).
2. *ib.*, 252.

Cross, " and the Lord Himself I beheld above the " Cross, not having any shape but only a voice."[1] The Acts of John is a later work than the Fourth Gospel, and is dated by Dr. James not later than the middle of the second century, but it gathers up into itself currents of docetic thought that must have been flowing in the Evangelist's day. The original Evangelist has made sure in his own way of the reality of the Risen Christ, but R will make assurance sure. He may have felt that the Figure of Jesus, as it is presented in the rest of the narrative in Chapter xx, has features which do not sufficiently mark it off from the purely docetic conceptions. If the Evangelist had been originally a Sadducee,[2] it is probable that he would not lay the same stress on the literal doctrine of the bodily resurrection as many of his contemporaries; indeed it is an arguable point whether the conception of a body which passes through closed doors at will, is consistent with such an emphasis on the material nature of the body as is implied in the story of the Empty Grave. Was the open door of the tomb necessary in such a view in order to make the Resurrection possible, and was the story of the stone rolled away only an argument that would appeal to those who, like R, laid much stress on the appeal to the senses as a foundation of faith?[3] Dr. Kirsopp Lake quotes

1. *ib.*, 253.
2. pp. 157 f.
3. The bearing of all this on the Thomas story will be discussed later. (pp. 312 ff.)

the saying of a certain Bishop Horsley in 1815, who maintained that the stone was only rolled away "not to let the Lord out, but to let the women in."[1]

The original Evangelist sought to safeguard the human reality of the dying Christ by relating that He thirsted on the Cross, and that the lance-thrust demonstrated that the body of Jesus was truly a human body.[2] The Thomas story is meant to shew that, after the Resurrection, appeal to the sense of touch is unnecessary.[3] R follows the tendency, already noticeable in Luke, to secure that identity, by proofs that would appeal to this sense. The words in Luke xxiv, 39—"Handle me "and see that a spirit hath not flesh and bones "as ye see me have"—contain a thought that was hammered out under stress of the docetic controversy. "The view gained ground that the "Risen Lord was of the same physical nature after "the Resurrection as before, and that the "appearances were those of a body of flesh and "blood."[4] Such ideas are the product of argumentative reflection on the corporeal substance of Our Lord's resurrection body. The apparent contradiction with the spiritual nature of the body, as suggested by the appearances and departures of the Risen Jesus at will, has been recognised by various commentators, who are reduced to the

1. *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 251.
2. See Professor Burkitt's note, *op. cit.*, p. 233.
3. pp. 312 f.
4. Kirsopp Lake, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

supposition that materiality was assumed for the moment, in order to satisfy the disciples that He had a body—surely a more severe form of the very Docetism which was opposed![1]

The Evangelist in his narrative of the Resurrection appearances has simply developed the thought of Paul. The Pauline position is that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," and that the believer's resurrection body, whilst intensely real, is not of the same substance as the flesh and blood of mortal life. "God giveth it a body as it pleaseth Him"—Paul never carries his speculation farther than this. We may suppose that in 1 Cor. xv, he assumes that the resurrection body of the Lord is of the same substance as that of the believer. He is as abhorrent as the opponents of Docetism themselves, and as the Evangelist and his Editor are, of the idea of a disembodied spirit. He shudders at the thought of being found naked and unclothed, a shadowy and tenuous, disembodied spirit. The Johannine narrative in verses 11–23 assumes the Pauline point of view, and there is an implied rejection of the docetic conception in the words, "He shewed them His hands and His side."[2] The spiritual body of Jesus actually bears the marks

1. E. R. Bernard, *Hastings' Bible Dict.*, says: "If there be a resurrection body, there is no reason why such a body should not have the power of taking food without depending on it." Passages in Sir Oliver Lodge's "Raymond" occur to the mind, similarly destitute of all religious value.

2. Apparently the Evangelist regards only the eye and the ear, as the means of Communion with the Risen Christ.

of crucifixion, and also the mark of the wound inflicted by the soldier's lance, on which the Evangelist lays such evidential stress in xix, 35. As will be seen later, some change occurs in the body, in the Evangelist's view, after the Ascension foretold to Mary, but the marks of the wounds are unaffected by it. There is nothing inconsistent from his point of view in the position that such a real body should appear in a room where the doors are fast closed. He is concerned to insist upon the identity of the Risen Jesus with the Christ whom he has portrayed in the rest of the Gospel, the Logos who became flesh; who tabernacled indeed for a short space among men, as it were between two eternities, but has never laid aside His true humanity. The voice that was sufficient to convince Mary in the garden is the same voice that spoke home to her heart and changed her life in bygone days. It is also the voice of the Word of God, which to this Evangelist can never suggest unreality; for is it not the voice of the "Truth"?

The tendency to interpret the Johannine form of the Gospel story in a docetic sense, of which the Editor appears to be afraid finds further illustration in the language of the docetic writing already referred to, called *The Acts of John*. The following passages may be quoted. "And having "thus spoken, he shewed me a cross of light fixed, "and above the cross a great multitude . . . And "the Lord Himself I beheld above the Cross, not

" having any shape but only a voice : and a voice " not such as was familiar to us, but one sweet " and kind and truly of God, saying unto me, . . . " This cross of light is sometimes called the word " by me for your sakes, sometimes Jesus, sometimes " Christ, sometimes door, sometimes a way, " sometimes bread, sometimes seed, sometimes " resurrection, sometimes Son, sometimes Father, " sometimes Spirit, sometimes life, sometimes truth, " sometimes grace. And by these names it is " called as towards men . . . Now the multitude of " one aspect that is about the cross is the lower " nature : and they whom thou seest in the cross, " if they have not one form, it is because, not yet " hath every member of him that came down " been comprehended " (98, 100). The echo of Johannine language in these passages is apparent (door, way, truth, etc.; " him that came down "), and they shew that it was customary in certain circles to twist the Johannine language into docetic forms. The Editor of the Gospel probably works under the pressure of opposition to such a method of interpretation, which induces him not only to insert the connecting links of time and place already referred to, so as to give a factual character to the narrative, but also here and there to accentuate the reality of certain occurrences in the Gospel,— notably in the case of the Lazarus miracle, and of his insertion of the story of the disciples at the empty grave. Just as he underlines the restoration

to life of the actual corpse of Lazarus, so he attaches great importance to the belief that the actual corpse of Jesus was endowed with life.

II. The Johannine Narrative in Chapter XX.

The subject of the present section is the original Johannine narrative of the Resurrection. Verses 2–10 have already been assigned to the Editor of the Gospel. One other verse must, I think, be assigned to the same source (verse 27), and will be dealt with in our discussion of the Thomas story. The contents of this section may be arranged under four topics:

1. The Appearance to Mary in the Garden (verses 1, 11–16).
2. The Evangelist's idea of the Ascension, and the First Appearance to the Assembled Disciples (verses 17–20).
3. The Thomas Story (verses 24–29).
4. The Gift of the Holy Spirit (verses 21–23).[1]

1. The Appearance to Mary (verses 1, 11–16).

That the story of the Empty Grave contains for the Evangelist no overwhelming apologetic significance is, I think, plain. The empty grave is, from his point of view, only the source of a pathetic mistake on Mary's part, inasmuch as it

1. These verses are assumed to have suffered displacement, and are set at the close of the Thomas story.

merely suggests to her that the body has been transferred elsewhere. Not even the sight of the angels assures her that the Lord is risen and alive, for she looks on them without astonishment, and the sight does not dry her tears. The answer to their question, "Why weepest thou?", is her piteous complaint that the body has been removed. So little does she connect the sight she has seen with the possibility of resurrection that she does not recognise Jesus in the figure standing behind her. The suggestion here contained that the belief in angels has no deep religious value is characteristic of the writer's mind. His silence regarding any assurance from the lips of angels that the Lord is risen is remarkable if we compare his account with those in the Synoptic Gospels. It is as though he would impress upon the minds of his readers that the earliest assurance of the Resurrection came from the lips of the Risen Lord Himself, and was guaranteed by His own presence.

Dramatic is too inadequate a word to apply to this description of the appearance of the Risen Lord to Mary; for if outward action be an inseparable component of drama, here it is almost absent. Almost the sole visible action of one of the characters—Mary's clasping the feet of Jesus—can only be inferred from His words, "Cling to me not." We are really witnessing a drama of the soul, a drama of character—not of the outward regions of character, but one that enacts itself in the inmost

recesses of the heart. Like one of Browning's dramas, the action takes place in the inner workings of the soul. The scene is an attempt to express in the language of the senses a theme remote from the world of sense : to make it real to " those who have not seen and yet have believed."

It is almost beyond our power to imagine what the death and burial of Jesus must have meant to one like Mary Magdalene. We are told that " out of her He had cast seven devils." From what life of misery and degradation and ill-health Our Lord had delivered her it surpasses imagination to conceive. No common bond of friendship united Our Lord and Mary. Her words are throbbing with despair—" They have taken away my Lord, " and I know not where they have laid Him." Not as in verse 12, " we know not," but " I know not." Hers is a grief that cannot be shared. On April 14, 1791, Mirabeau's funeral day, Carlyle tells us that there entered a Paris restaurant a certain man of letters, to whom the waiter remarked, " Fine weather, Sir ! " The reply came, " Yes, my " friend, very fine, but Mirabeau is dead." The mood of Mary, as she stood in the garden, seems to have been similar. The Evangelist tells us that the grave was in a garden, but Mary had eyes only for the grave. There were probably other graves near, but she has eyes only for this one. To one in such a mood, even a vision of angels would arouse but little interest. The picture suggested to us is of

the two angels bowed in wonder and adoration at what had happened, "one at the head and the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain." It was a happening which "angels desired to look into." Thus do angels appear at the cradle and at the grave of Our Lord, viewing with wonder the love that had brought Him to earth, the depth of love that was revealed in His subjection to death, and the power that has delivered Him from the captivity of the grave. But Mary looks on this sight unmoved.

There is rare, psychological insight in this portrait of Mary Magdalene in her sorrow. The Evangelist is no abstract philosopher nor argumentative debater on behalf of the Christian faith, but is one who gives us a glimpse into the universal Christian soul. Men and women are wonderfully alike when stirred by a deep emotion, not least when visited by great sorrow. The vision of angels is to Mary as unmeaning, as to others, in moods of grief and despair, words of Scripture appear, or traditional doctrines of the faith, or as in the story of Thomas, even the direct testimony of human experience. Such testimonies sound glorious and comforting, but never penetrate to our inmost hearts.

> That with this bright believing band
> I have no claim to be.
> That faiths by which my comrades stand
> Seem phantasies to me,
> And mirage-mists their shining land,
> Is a drear destiny.

It is not " the Lord " but " my Lord " that such stricken souls seek. For them, it is not the Church's Lord that has been taken away, but a very dear personal friendship that has been broken. The words recall to our minds in one of those echoes of Luke's Gospel, so frequent in the Fourth, the plaint of the Emmaus travellers, " And when they found " not His body, they came saying that they had " also seen a vision of angels, which said that He " was alive . . . but Him they saw not." The Fourth Evangelist seeks in his own way to asseverate that no matter how beautifully, how clearly, how finally, or with what weight of incontrovertible and infallible argument carrying even divine authority, the everlasting truth that Christ rose from the dead be presented, in order to know that the truth is everlasting and carries a direct message to our own hearts, we must re-discover and re-experience it in ourselves.

The scene is tense with feeling finely subdued. The rising emotion of the story is gathered into the narrow channel of a single word " Mary," and flows into our hearts as we read, until we also say " Rabboni." It is the greatest recognition scene in all literature. In the bare recording of these words, " Mary," " Rabboni," the Evangelist has accomplished perfectly and easily what many a finer equipment of literary skill than he possesses has striven in vain to do. As in many other places throughout the Gospel, he has individualised a

story, and has thus broken through what had become even in his time a mechanical tradition of evidences for the Resurrection, where the various personalities had become subordinated to the proofs which they furnished. He shews us faith happening in an individual soul, as sunrise happens in the sky. We are made aware of the appeal of living, human experience to its like in ourselves. And we may also conclude that he could not have described as he has done that scene in the garden unless he too, in some secret garden of his own soul, had been called to faith by the voice of his Lord.

What is the Evangelist's attitude towards the story of the Empty Grave? The simplest way to describe it is to say that he takes it for granted, and that he attaches to it no particular apologetic significance. He regards as the first great fact in the resurrection story that Jesus appeared to individual disciples, and that after the Ascension He appeared to the assembled disciples, of whom in all probability Mary was one. According to the thought of his time, such appearances would implicitly be regarded as impossible unless the grave were empty. In the minds of the earliest believers—and this Evangelist has many points of contact with the primitive tradition—it was a natural inference from their belief otherwise established in the Resurrection. To a later generation, as to us, the Empty Grave has tended to become an

essential without which faith in the Resurrection is impossible, or at least incomplete. Paul indeed says that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, but it does not therefore follow that in his view the flesh and blood are left to moulder in the grave. Paul, and no doubt the Fourth Evangelist also, in obedience to certain semi-physical notions of spiritual existence foreign to our thought, believed that "flesh and blood" are changed into the substance of the spiritual body, which is no mere phantom. "He shall change the "body of our humiliation, and make it like unto "His body of glory." The Evangelist tacitly accepts the Pauline doctrine as part of the religious equipment with which he sets out. The Risen Christ is "the first-fruits of them that sleep," and what has happened to His body will happen to the bodies of all believers at the Resurrection. As has been said, the Jewish form of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, in a scientific aspect, is foreign to our manner of thinking, because it is founded on a semi-physical basis of thought. Its permanent religious value consists in the fact that it enshrines the belief that all that is noblest and dearest in our human life on earth, as expressed in bodily life, will not be annihilated. The article of our faith which the doctrine of the resurrection of the body represents, is not based upon a physical phenomenon which, however possible to Jewish scientific thought, is to ours a sheer contradiction

of all that science tells us. Sight is not, after all

> "To such a tender ball as the eye confined,
> "So obvious and so easy to be quenched."

All the moral discipline, the beauty, and the greatness which the life of the senses in our mortal state is meant to yield, is indestructible for every believer in the Incarnation and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, who has for ever sanctified and ennobled it. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is at once a protest against asceticism and sensuality.

Similarly, the doctrine of the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ does not derive its religious value according as the story of the Empty Grave is true or false. This Evangelist shews a true instinct when he refrains from elaborating that question as a primary, apologetic consideration, and bases his thought on the resurrection tradition in its most primitive form of the appearances to disciples. The earliest form of the tradition no doubt included the empty grave as an obvious truth, but not until later did any apologetic stress begin to be laid upon it. Mr. Montefiore is partly right when he says that "the faith of the Risen Messiah owes "nothing to the discovery of the empty tomb. "No story of the empty tomb had reached the "disciples when that faith was born within them." The same writer indeed infers that on this account there was no such story to tell, but the inference is not warranted, whatever interpretation may be put on the facts. It was only in the later stages of the

resurrection controversy that the fact became crucial. By the time discussion had become acute, largely in the interest of anti-docetic opinion, regarding the identity of the risen body of Jesus with the body of His earthly life, it would necessarily be accepted on both sides that, even if it were desired either to prove or to disprove the story, the processes of natural decay had already rendered all investigation inept and fruitless. The terms of the discussion, as they have come down to us, are derived from the statements and counter-statements of the parties concerned as these have been preserved in tradition. As has already been suggested, the editorial addition, verses 2–10, is an example of the position which the question had come to occupy in the minds of the more conservative and traditional party in the Christian church. In the experience of both the disciples referred to in that passage, the foundation of their faith in the Resurrection was laid in what they saw in the empty tomb, and the assurance that the body was gone. On the other hand the Evangelist does not give such a place to the story of the Empty Grave. For him, faith in the Resurrection rests primarily on spiritual grounds, grounds of experience and not of logic.

The story of the appearance to Mary in the the garden is a dramatic rendering of a spiritual perception, the rich symbol of a universal experience. The Evangelist's thought goes much deeper than a desire to reproduce an actual outward scene would

take him. As in the Thomas story, the creative mind of the writer has been at work upon hints and suggestions which he received from the written narrative or the oral tradition. The many subtle touches in this story of the appearance in the garden make us feel the pulse of a life within it. His thought is not tethered to bare historical fact, but " wanders through eternity," and like every true dramatist he makes us aware of the love, both human and divine, that triumphs over death. He is only reproducing in an individualised form, and with a background of reality, the significance of the words, " The sheep hear his voice, and he calleth " his own sheep by name . . . The sheep follow him, " because they know his voice . . . they know not " the voice of strangers." The Evangelist has given outward bodily form to a happening in the world of spirit. There is in his narrative a deep consciousness that by the Death and Resurrection of Jesus, the believer has become an inhabitant of a new and higher order of things. The whole narrative in Chapter xx is luminous with the conception of an over-world or kingdom of truth or reality, in which those who belong to it hear the voice of Christ. " Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice." After the Resurrection, Jesus manifests Himself to His disciples in another way than to the world.

In the Lucan tradition, as exemplified in the Emmaus story, the women's account of the message

of the angels at the grave is mentioned, only to be set aside by an incredulous community as an idle tale. In Luke xxiv, 11, the women are convinced by the angels' message that Jesus is risen. This is mentioned in xxiv, 24, but with the added words, "Him they saw not," suggesting a certain defect in their evidence. This defect is supplied by the story of the appearance to Mary. Mark tells us that the effect on the minds of the women of the open grave is terror and incoherence of thought.[1] Sceptical minds would draw therefrom the inevitable inference that such a mental condition rules out the trustworthiness of their evidence. As against this objection, the description of Mary's emotion is not without significance. The tears of Mary Magdalene are as much the fruit of nervous prostration as of grief, the sign of the breaking-point after three days of terrible strain. She talks wildly to the supposed gardener of carrying away the body herself, if only she knew where it had been laid. "Tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will carry him away." She is recalled to lucid and normal perception by the voice of Christ. The sound of her name falls with fine effect on her disordered spirit; she responds swiftly with the word "Rabboni." From that moment, the empty grave, of which we have had a single glimpse in verses 11, 12, recedes from view.

1. Mark xvi, 8, *τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις* (i.e., an overmastering emotion).

2. The Ascension and the First Appearance to the Disciples (verses 17–20).

In verse 17 it is implied that Mary had laid hold of Jesus to clasp His feet. The stern prohibition is laid upon her, "Do not cling to me; for I am not "yet ascended unto the Father: but go unto my "brethren, and say to them, I ascend (lit., I am "ascending) unto my Father and your Father, "and to my God and your God." Everything depends on the meaning assigned to the present tense, "I am ascending" (ἀναβαίνω). The words are in contrast with the previous utterance, "I have not "yet ascended," which both gives a reason for the prohibition "Do not cling to me," and also seems to imply an invitation to resume the close relationship between them after the Ascension has taken place. When does the Evangelist regard the Ascension as taking place, and as becoming an accomplished fact? Do the words, "I am ascending" imply a process still continuing through the subsequent appearances,[1] or do they mean that the Ascension is even now beginning and will shortly be accomplished? Has it already taken place before the subsequent appearances to the assembled disciples?[2]

1. cf. A. E. Garvie, *The Beloved Disciple*, p. 185.
2. If Luke xxiv, 51 "And He was taken up into heaven," is regarded as genuine (cf. Acts i, 2), the Ascension in Luke's Gospel is regarded as taking place on Easter day. In Acts i, 9, however, the Ascension takes place after an interval of forty days.

As against the view that the Ascension is a process which continues throughout the appearances, the fact that Jesus confers the Holy Spirit on the apostles in verse 22 would on general grounds go to prove that the Ascension, according to this Evangelist, had already taken place: for the Holy Spirit, in the teaching of this Gospel, is a gift that is received from the hands of Christ after He has "gone to the Father."[1] Moreover, particular attention may be focussed on these words from the Farewell Discourses: "A little while, and ye "behold me no more: and again a little while and "ye shall see me. Some of His disciples therefore "said one to another, what is this that He saith "unto us, a little while, and ye behold me not; "and again a little while, and ye shall see me: "and because I go to the Father? They said "therefore, What is this that He saith, a little "while. We know not what He saith."[2] These words quite evidently find their explanation and fulfilment in the passage before us. Verse 17 must, in my opinion, be interpreted as meaning that the Ascension takes place some time between the events of verses 11–18 and verses 19–29.

The ascending to the Father of verses 17, 18 can scarcely have any other meaning, especially if taken in connexion with such utterances as xiv, 12 and xiv, 23. The "little while" which gives the

1. xvi, 7.
2. xvi, 16–19.

disciples such perplexity would then refer to the interval between the appearance to Mary in the garden and the appearance to the disciples behind closed doors. The conception is in close agreement with the attitude which the Evangelist adopts towards the fact of the empty grave. Not direct from the empty grave, but from the glory with the Father, Jesus returns to re-form the tie that had been broken, and to bestow the Holy Spirit upon His disciples.

Purely spatial conceptions of the Ascension may come between us and a proper understanding of the universal element which is present in the Evangelist's thought. The Lucan account both in the Gospel and in Acts describes a local ascension, the uplifting of Christ beyond the clouds and His departure out of sight. The difficulty in the interpretation of the Johannine thought is to determine how far, if at all, the Evangelist's conception of the Ascension is coloured by the idea of a local Ascension. It is just as difficult to determine his mode of thought as it is for us to assimilate completely the language of Isaiah when he sees " the Lord, high and lifted up." " Lifted up " is the term applied in this Gospel to the crucifixion (xii, 31), and obviously contains the idea, in the allusive fashion often employed by the writer, that the Cross is the first step in the entrance of Jesus into His glory—rather His re-entrance into the glory which He had " before " the foundation of the world." To that original

glory is now added the splendour of His life on earth, and the redemption of humanity that has been " finished " or perfected. The humanity is not laid aside by the Logos-Christ at His Ascension.

Does the Johannine thought leave room for the idea of a local Ascension, and if so, how is it related to the general scheme of thought which is apparent in the rest of the Gospel ?

Professor E. F. Scott[1] interprets what he calls the real Johannine thought as follows : " His own " interpretation allowed no room for an Ascension " such as is described by the writer of Acts. He " thought of the rising from the dead as at once " Christ's entrance into glory and His return in " power to the waiting disciples." He goes on to suggest that alongside this there are indications of the persistence of the primitive tradition in which Resurrection, Ascension, and Pentecost are successive moments in the story of the Risen Lord, commemorated ultimately in the conventional " Church year." These indications, he adds, are only " concessions " on the part of the Evangelist to the primitive tradition " which he sought to conserve in form, even while in substance he broke with it." His actual point of view is that direct from the grave Jesus returned to share the glory which He had with the Father from the beginning of all things. This entrance into glory was at the same

1. *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 308. cf. *supra*, pp. 78 ff.

time His return in power—all that was expressed in the Pauline Parousia—to His Church. Not as in Hebrews did the Saviour, after His redemptive work, simply depart "to sit down on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens."[1] His return to the Father also meant that He returned to be with His people, and to commune with them not as He had done with the first disciples, for a season—but for ever. There is undoubtedly in the work of the Fourth Evangelist a transmutation of the more realistic conception of the primitive thought into more spiritual forms, a transmutation which may be due, not merely to the Evangelist's inherent type of thought, but to a finer understanding of the consciousness of Jesus. It is, however, quite possible that the writer who can speak of being "born from above," and who conceives of the Christ as being "lifted up," should also be capable of thinking under the form at least of a local Ascension, without there being present any deliberate and conscious "concession" to older points of view.

The Evangelist believes in a Christ who has "ascended"; that "no man hath ascended into "heaven save He that came down from heaven, "the Son of Man." He also believes that this ascended Christ reigns in the heart of every believer. The Ascension of Christ is to him the great religious dynamic of the Church. "Greater things than

1. Hebrews i, 3.

" these shall ye do, because I go unto my Father."[1] Thus a narrative of the events after the Resurrection, conceived as they are in dramatic form, must necessarily include the Ascension, which, however spatially expressed, is not spatially conceived and religiously, is an abiding event in the history of the Church. It is the " ascended " Christ, the Christ who has returned to His eternal glory, who appears to the assembled disciples. The appearance to Mary in the garden restores the individual faith, but she is commanded not to cling to Him as yet : abiding communion is attained by the individual Christian only in fellowship with the community. The Holy Spirit, the gift of the Ascended Christ, is in the first instance a gift to the community. Neither the Fourth Evangelist nor Paul allows for the idea of a solitary Christian. Thomas was not with them when Jesus " came," and it is only in the midst of the assembled disciples that His faith is restored and the full confession of personal faith is uttered, " My Lord and my God." The Evangelist emphasises both Thomas' absence on the first occasion (verse 24), and his presence on the second (verse 26).

It is remarkable that the title ' Lord ' (κύριος) —apart from the editorial passages in the Gospel[2]—

1. A great amount of perplexity would be saved if the " Ascension " of our Lord could be thought of in the Johannine terms " I go to the Father." cf. A. Boyd Scott, *Nevertheless we Believe*, p. 84.

2. pp. 306 ff.

is used so frequently in the twentieth chapter. In verse 18 Mary prefaces her announcement of the Ascension with the statement "I have seen the Lord"; the assembled disciples are "glad when they saw the Lord." But to give to Jesus the title "Lord" was not in the view of this Evangelist sufficient. This title of κύριος, implied that Christ was a Divine Being, but in that Gentile world there were many Divine beings other than the one Supreme God. The various cults of the time recognised "gods many and lords many." Paul claims that Christ's title of "Lord" is "a name which is above every name." (Philipp. ii, 9 ff). It is probable that the Evangelist has found the title "Lord" quite insufficient in that Gentile world to express the full Divine content of the Person of Christ. For that reason, he introduces the Logos doctrine which, as the Prologue shows, is guarded against any appearance of a denial of monotheism. The dialogue in Chapter viii shows that the worship of Christ as God was a real offence to Jewish opponents. "The difficulty which the "Logos doctrine is an attempt to meet is one which "must have arisen at a very early date. The "ordinary Gentile would find no difficulty in "worshipping Christ as 'Kyrios' or 'Lord,' that "is, as a Divine Being other than the Supreme."[1] The Logos-Christ is, as we would say, God immanent, both in Man and in Nature, and to

1. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 457.

worship the Lord made flesh is to worship God. Hence the Gospel ends as it began, with the return of Christ to the Father, i.e., His Ascension, and the full confession of Christian faith voiced by Thomas, "My Lord and My God."

3. The Appearance to Thomas (verses 24–29).

Further consideration has led me to withdraw from the position once advocated that the Thomas story is an editorial addition.[1] One primary difficulty which stood in the way of regarding the story as part of the original Gospel, namely, that Thomas is apparently excluded from the gift of the Holy Spirit, and that the Gospel seems to end naturally at verse 23, is removed, if we assume that one of those strangely numerous displacements of the text of the Gospel has here occurred. The suggestion is that verses 21–23 are to be inserted after verse 29. This rearrangement has also the advantage that Jesus' reiterated greeting "Peace be unto you" in verse 21 is more in place. It is also reasonable to suppose that the mention of the gladness of the first company of disciples (verse 20) would naturally and immediately be followed by the contrasted despair of Thomas.

Hesitation, however, is still present when we come to consider verse 27. The difficulty is not, I think, that Jesus invites Thomas to do what he

1. *The Fourth Gospel: its Significance and Environment*, pp. 230 ff.

forbids Mary to do in verse 17.[1] Rather it is that the words spoken to Thomas by Our Lord recall the materialistic conception of the Risen Body which we find in Luke xxiv, 39, and which is also suggested in Thomas's own words in verse 25. These are not rightly regarded as the utterance of a sceptic, and his doubt is not intellectual. Thomas is the "realist" among the disciples, and may be regarded as standing for the same materialistic attitude towards the resurrection body, exemplified in the Lucan tradition, to which the Fourth Evangelist is opposed. Moreover, the words uttered by Jesus are a careful repetition of the disciple's own words in verse 25. Not only so, but it seems hardly in keeping with the conception of the Risen Jesus in this Gospel that He should thus compromise with such a point of view as that for which Thomas stood, even if the words are gently and compassionately ironical. Moreover, it seems to the present writer that verse 27 interprets Thomas's mood too grossly, and offers an intellectual and sensuous piece of evidence to a despairing soul. In this verse we seem to detect the same attitude of mind as in verses 2–10, where the two disciples carefully assure themselves that the grave is empty. As in this insertion into the midst of the Mary story, the tense, emotional character of the Johannine narrative is missed. The Editor is again underlining

1. The word translated 'cling' (ἅπτομαι) in verse 17, is not used in verse 27.

as in verses 2–10—this time by the utterance of Jesus Himself—the fact that the actual corpse of Jesus was raised from the grave.[1]

The words of Thomas in verse 25 are not the utterance of a sceptic, who merely demands ocular proof. As in xi, 16, he gloomily and somewhat impatiently envisages the death of Jesus in Jerusalem, a fate which in sheer, desperate loyalty they all must share; as in xiv, 5, he can see no firm road before him on which a man might plant his travelling feet, so in xx, 25, he speaks as a man upon whose imagination is branded the inescapable fact that Jesus was crucified. He speaks as a man whose whole vision of Jesus is focussed on the desperate spectacle of the wounds and especially the spear-thrust. In his words, he seeks rather to emphasise these in all their brutal negation of the faith held by his fellows, than to contemplate the possibility of seeing and touching them, no longer open but healed. He could see nothing else but these ghastly proofs of death. "Thomas was "confused rather than disbelieving; and his

1. The Apocryphal work, *The Epistle of the Apostles*, translated for the first time into English, by Dr. M. R. James (*The Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. 485 ff.), and probably belonging to about the middle of the second century, contains many reminiscences of the Johannine Gospel. It is anti-docetic in tone, and has several references to the "touching" of Jesus after the Resurrection. The mind of R has affinity with the mind of this writer. "But that ye may know that I am He, do "thou, Peter, put thy finger into the print of the nails in mine "hands, and thou also, Thomas, put thy finger into the wound of "the spear in my side; but thou, Andrew, look on my feet and "see whether they press the earth; for it is written in the prophet: "A phantom of a devil maketh no footprint on the earth." (§ 11).

" confusion was due more to the defect of character " than to badness of heart. He was a man whose " heart was more active than his head. And thus " he drank into his soul the Lord's teaching and " life faster than his mind could frame it into ideas. " In the fellowship of his God, though he knew it " not, he lived a charmed and enchanted life, dream- " ing rather than thinking. And when that, out of " which he drew his life, was taken away, he was " bewildered and hardly knew where his conflicting " feelings were hurrying him."[1] Thomas does not obey the invitation given by Jesus, which is an additional reason for regarding verse 27 as an interruption. He saw, like the others, the hands and the side, and that was sufficient for him as for his fellows. His adoring confession, " My Lord and my God," is his answer to the appearance of Jesus, and to His greeting " Peace be unto you ! " It is significant that to one who by his very despair, thus bore witness to the reality of the crucifixion, there should be given the privilege of uttering the Great Confession of the Christian Church. In vi, 68, 69, the Confession of Peter, made in the Synoptics on behalf of the whole apostolic band, is not only given in a less emphatic form, but is met by the prophecy of the traitorous act of Judas. In the Fourth Gospel, the Church is founded on a confession like that of Thomas, and these are not excluded, but rather to them is ascribed the supreme

1. A. B. Davidson, *The Called of God*, p. 323.

beatitude, who have not, like these men, had the opportunity of seeing, touching, handling the word of Life. The testimony of sense is unnecessary for perfect faith. The founding of the Church is a creative act: "He breathed on them," and said, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit."

The key to the meaning of Thomas's confession, "My Lord and my God," seems to be found in the very fact that it includes the title "Lord," so frequently used in Chapter xx, and transcends it in "My God." The correlative of "slave" (δοῦλος), is "Master," or "Lord" (κύριος). Even the title "Rabboni," used by Mary in the Garden, really means "My great one," as "Rabbi" really means "Great One." It is a title of respect. Originally it may have meant a learned expounder of the Scriptures and religious traditions. The "Rabbis" in Jesus' day had already become the Jewish religious guides. "After the destruction of "Jerusalem and the collapse of the Jewish state, "they became their only religious guides. "Consequently the Jewish leader of religion and "the teacher of religious lore became synonymous."[1] Thus "Rabbi" is really synonymous with the idea contained in κύριος, and implies a servile relationship. The title κύριος was also claimed by the Emperors, and the worshippers of Mithra greeted him as "Lord." The Fourth Evangelist evidently seeks after a confession of faith which

1. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, p. 42.

should be free as far as possible from pagan and political associations, and transcend merely national conceptions such as "Christ"; one also that would be in accordance with the relationship of the believer to Christ, in which he is no longer called "slave" but "friend." He finds this in the Confession of Thomas. "The Pauline formula Κύριος Ἰησοῦς " is not enough for him. When Thomas says 'My " 'Lord and My God,' what is implied really is, " 'It *is* Jesus Himself, and now I recognise Him " 'as Divine.'"[1]

4. The Gift of the Spirit (verses 21–23).

The shewing of the wounds is a demonstration that the Death, Resurrection, and Ascension are past—moments only in the one continuous progress towards the glory which Jesus had before the foundation of the world. He shews them the wounds because they are healed, and are symbols of a "peace" that does not now, as in the upper room, fight with all the facts, but is the fruit of a decisive victory over the forces of evil. Jesus has not merely returned to life, but has returned to reign. He is indeed "The Lord," and more. "God hath highly exalted Him and given Him a name that is above every name." Thomas has confessed Him as "Lord and God," has at the close of the Gospel given Him the place that is claimed for Him in the Prologue.

1. *ib.*, p. 48.

Paul delivered the doctrine of the Spirit in the primitive Church from becoming a merely fitful, ecstatic and non-ethical experience, when he identified the presence of the Spirit with the manifestation of the Christian graces—the fruits of the Spirit—love, joy, peace. For Paul also, as for the writer of this Gospel, the Spirit in religious experience is identified with the presence of the Risen Christ, His "alter ego." "The Lord is the Spirit." In this Gospel, the relationship between the Risen Lord and the Spirit is even more closely defined. The Spirit is the creative activity of the Risen Christ. "He breathed on them, and said, "'Receive ye the Holy Spirit.'"

"Breathed on them"—to us the words appear to suggest a strange semi-physical form of thought, which no doubt they imply. We must however realise that the same imagination is at work behind these words as meets us in the Prologue. We must go back to the story of creation in Genesis, where, in the act of man's creation, it is said that "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." This is the idea in the writer's mind. In the Prologue the Christ is represented as the Creative Word of God, and He has become so in a deeper sense, now that the work of redemption is past. He creates new men to be His fellow-labourers. "Whosoever "sins ye forgive, they are forgiven; whosoever "sins ye retain, they are retained." Here is no mere priestly conception. It means that to every

disciple of Christ, every member of the Christian community who abides in closest communion with his Lord, is given the last and final word on the sins of frail humanity; the last and decisive word in removing the wrongs of our tangled world; the last and decisive power of judgment on the distinction between right and wrong. It is a dangerous gift, fraught with grave responsibility, and only to be exercised by the Spirit of Christ, working in and through His people.

I. GENERAL INDEX

Acts of John, The, 29, 288
Analysis of Gospel, 94ff
" Alien Fragments," 70ff, 79ff
Angus, S., 125, 142
Abbott, E. A., 169
Agape, The, 219
Apathy, 267
Apocalyptic Writings, 186ff
Apocryphal Gospels, Analogies with, 67ff
Arnold, M., 121, 223, 265
Ascension, The, 305ff
Astrology, 135
Augustine, 51f
Aurelius, Marcus, 31, 203, 265
Authorship, 45ff, 157ff
Autobiographical Touches, 44

" Beloved Disciple," The, 45ff
Bevan, E., 264, 269
Blood, Drinking of, 206
Boussett, W., 105*n*
Bradley, A. C., 45
Browning, R., 22, 46, 63
Burkitt, F. C., 37, 40*n*, 90, 105*n*, 159, 179
Butcher, S. H., 35

Caiaphas, 19f
" Children of God," 202
Cleansing of Temple, The, 75f, 85ff
Cleanthes, 201
Controversies, 74, 175
" Crowd," The, 230f
Crucifixion, Date of, 247

Davidson, A. B., 815
Davidson, W. L., 263
Death of Jesus, Dramatic Interpretation of, 13ff, 18ff
Deissmann, A., 130, 139
De la Mare, W., 211
Didache, The, 35, 37
Dill, M., 129, 133f, 154
Divinity, Pagan Conception of, 150
Docetism, 28f, 287ff

Empty Grave, The, 286ff, 299ff
Epictetus, 200, 267
Eschatology, 184ff, 191
Ethics, Contribution of Gospel to, 36ff
Euripides, 81, 147
Faith, Conception of, 91ff
Flesh, Eating of, 206

" Glory," 91
Glover, T. R., 149, 261
Gwatkin, H., 40*n*

Hadrian, Hymn of, 126
Haggadah, 71
Harris, J. Rendel, 259*n*
Hermetic Literature, 138f
Historical Fact, Significance for Christian Faith of, 24, 30, 34, 63
Historicity of Gospel, 26ff, 178ff
History, Ancient Idea of, 67
Holy Spirit, 43f, 82, 191, 310, 317
Horace, 264
" Hour," The, 250ff
Hutton, R. H., 35, 165, 226

" I am " Formula, 139

Ignatius, 31, 176f, 209ff
Incarnation as Historical Fact, Religious Value of, 148f
Intolerance of Christianity, The, 117f

Jesus Christ :—
  Apocalyptic Language, Use of, 188ff
  " Love" of Jesus, The, 268
  Messiahship, 109
  Person of, 15ff
  Self-determination of, 268
Judaism in the Empire, 193ff
Judas, 196, 261

" Knowledge " of God, The, 150

Lake, Kirsopp, 289
Lazarus, 21, 38, 225ff
Logos, The, 120
" Lord," The, 105f, 311
Lucian, 67, 127ff

" Manna," The, 214
Mary, The Mother of Jesus, 56ff
Mary Magdalene, 280ff
Masefield, John, 46
Menander, 125
Meyer, Edouard, 74
Micklem, E. R., 163
Milton, John, 46
Moffatt, J., 96
Murray, Gilbert, 135, 137
Mystery-Religions :—141ff
  " Deification," 143
  Dissent, Pioneers of, 145
  " Salvation," 143

Nathanael, 195
Nicodemus, 161f, 172, 175

Papias, 65f
Parousia, 190
Paul, 11ff, 54, 116, 120, 127, 202, 242f, 291
Philo, 30, 72, 214
Pilate, 20
Plato, 35, 123, 146
" Power," 169
" Prince of this World," The 160
Prologue, The, 17, 61, 67, 137f, 157
Purchas, H. T., 219

Ramsay, W. M., 134
Resurrection of the Body, 126, 160

Sadducaic Thought in the Gospel, 158, 190, 243
Scott, E. F., 78, 245f, 247
Seneca, 117
Shakespeare, W., 45
Stoicism, 122, 136, 200ff, 260ff
Spiritual Healing, 135
Streeter, B. H., 53, 172
Synoptic Gospels, Relation to :—
  Contrast with, 22f, 63ff
  Dependence on, 43
  Miracle, Similarity in Conception of, 153ff
  Person of Christ, Similarity in Conception of, 166

Tatian, 156
Thomas, 290, 312ff

Vaughan, C. E., 81f
Virgin-Birth, The, 197

Weiss, J., 105
Wordsworth, W., 59*n*, 61f
Worship, 211

Zahn, Th., 276*n*

II. INDEX OF SCRIPTURE PASSAGES.

Isaiah liii 241
Matt. viii, 11, 12 . . 183
Matt. xi, 2, 3 . . . 162
Matt. xii, 6 . . . 76, 87
Matt. xiv, 62 . . . 183
Matt. xxiv, 36 . . . 259
Matt. xxvi, 53 . . . 259
Matt. xxviii, 13 . . . 287
Mark ii, 10f 163
Mark vi, 41 216
Mark vi, 43 221
Mark viii, 14ff . . . 168
Mark xiii 186
Mark xvi, 9 . . . 285*n*

Luke xiii, 31ff . . . 258
Luke xxiv, 12 . . . 281
Luke xxiv, 39 . . . 290

Acts xxiii, 8 158
1 Cor. xv, 5 . . . 285*n*
1 Cor. xv, 33 . . . 124
2 Cor. iii, 17 105
Gal. iii, 15 ff . . . 196
1 John, i, 1 55

John, Gospel of :—
i, 1—18 . . . . 16f
i, 31—34 77
i, 35—40 49
i, 35—ii, 22 . . 87ff
i, 40 49
i, 51 78
ii, 1 103
ii, 1—10 . . . 89, 217
ii, 4 . . . 76f, 271
ii, 12 104
ii, 22 90
ii, 23—25 104
iii, 19 162
iii, 22—24 104
iv, 1—3 105
iv, 1—42 73
iv, 21, 23 252
iv, 43—46 108
iv, 48 161
v, 1—9 135
v, 25 251
v, 28, 29 79
v. 37—41 . . . . 33f
vi, 15 109
vi, 16—21 222
vi, 22, 23 110
vi, 26 161
vi, 30 161
vi, 52—60 . . . 205ff
vi, 61—63 . . . 212
vi, 66 206
vii, 1 110
vii, 1—14 273
vii, 10 110
vii, 19, 23 199
viii, 15, 16 . . . 252
viii, 17 199
viii, 17—48 . . 180ff
x, 34 199
x, 35 199
xi, 1, 2 234
xi, 1—16 275
xi, 3—5 235
xi, 6 227
xi, 9, 10 227
xi, 16 314
xi, 34 237
xi, 39, 40 233
xi, 44 . . . . . 236*n*
xi, 45, 46 231
xii, 1—8 . . . . 277ff
xii, 28 159
xii, 42 49
xiii, 1 50
xiii, 1—15 . . . 215
xiv, 21, 24 . . . 51
xv, 25 199
xvi, 14 42
xvi, 16ff 183
xvii, 1 251
xviii, 15 49

xviii, 16 157
xix, 24, 29, 36 . . . 199
xix, 25—27 56
xix, 27 251
xix, 35 56
xix, 42 287
xx, 2 48
xx, 2—10 . . . . 280ff
xx, 6, 7 . . . . 236*n*
xx, 11—16. . . . 294ff
xx, 17 78
xx, 17—20. . . . 305ff
xx, 21—23. . . . 317ff
xx, 24—29. . . . 312ff
xx, 28 . . . . . 107*n*
xx, 29 . . . . . 56*n*
xx, 30, 31 . . 41, 59f, 92
xxi 47, 53

DATE DUE

BS 2615.2 .S719 1925

Strachan, Robert Harvey,
1873-

The fourth evangelist :

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS2615.2 .S719 1925
Strachan, Rob The fourth evangelist :
3 0645 0004 3351 2